



URSE

ROYAL MILITARY CANAL

**PRINCES PARADE SITE**

# **PRINCES PARADE SITE ALLOCATION STUDY**

## **BASELINE CONSULTATION REPORT: APPENDICES**

Draft report | October 2012

**Allies and Morrison  
Urban Practitioners**

## **Appendix A: Email and Postal Consultation Feedback**

Copies of letters and emails that have been received are included below. These have been anonymised but the list of respondents where names were given is listed:

Jack Pound  
Carol Miles  
Margaret Ludlow  
Lesley Whybrow  
Mrs. McLintic  
June J  
Mrs Danner  
Lesley Whybrow  
Jean Baker  
Colin Colson MBE  
Ann & Barry Hawkins  
John and Mary Mortimer  
John Charlton  
Ken Irons  
Ann Hawkins  
Simon Karpetas  
Val Danner  
Tim Raymond  
Roger Ballard and Elizabeth Ballard  
Christine Farrell  
Jo Letchford  
Rene-Martin  
Mark Lancaster

Dear Mr Chambers,

with regards to the proposed development of Princess Parade, Hythe.

It has been brought to my notice, that at the end of the Korean war in the 1950's, Princess Parade was used for six months as a dump for military ordnance, including LIVE ammunition. [Would actual evidence be in the files of previous reports? If so, why pay for, yet another site assessment?](#)

[I would be grateful for your thoughts on the matter.](#)

Yours,

Mr Chambers,

I am appalled to hear of proposals to develop Princes Parade. It would be a travesty to build on this open green space that is so much a feature of the Hythe/Seabrook landscape and so valued by residents both human and animal.

What is wrong with the existing site for a new pool? Is it not true that Seabrook School already have a preferred site and funds, not location are the issue?

Like so many other people, I work full time and cannot attend the drop-in session on Thursday. I will however do my utmost to attend the information session on Saturday but in case I cannot, I wish to register my opposition of the scheme with you and trust that you will take local residents opinions into consideration in this matter.

Regards

Dear planning committee. Keep your hands off the jewel in Hythe's crown which is Princes parade. There is a lot of wildlife on the area as well as being a place we all love to go , all ages as it is flat . Please do not spoil one of the remaining oasis of our area along with the Fish Market and Lympne Airport. We need these green spaces for our well being and for the precious wild life which is finding increasingly difficulty finding anywhere to live. We do not want another Benidorm thank you. Yours Sincerely

Dear Mr Walker

I have just emailed Louise Mansfield to ask that your public sessions be more widely advertised - in particular along the canal and Princes Parade and in Seabrook itself (maybe at the newsagents) as I think it's important that those people who will be most affected by the development of the site should be kept informed about what is being discussed. I understand that Louise is on annual leave so I would be grateful if you would organise this. It might be a bit short notice for Thursday but there is still time for you to advertise your stall in Hythe on July 28.

I believe that KCC have invited you to the next meeting of the Hythe Forum which is to be held in Seabrook. This was originally proposed for Fri 27th July but has been postponed partly to enable you, the consultants, to attend. However, I have been told that no date has yet been fixed as the officer responsible has been unable to arrange anything with you.

Perhaps you would contact him directly:

[james.harman@kent.gov.uk](mailto:james.harman@kent.gov.uk)

as I am sure you would welcome the chance to involve as many local people as possible.

Hi,

I am writing to you because I am very disturbed and upset at any idea of developing the Princes Parade area in Hythe/Seabrook. It is a very beautiful area of natural countryside, which is both a haven for wildlife and popular for walking, cycling, canoeing, horse-riding etc. You only have to go to the area yourself to see how popular it is with everyone and the idea of having it built upon would be a blot on the landscape.

We have a holiday home at Seabrook and enjoy the beautiful beach/canal walks with the lovely rolling countryside in the back ground and have many visitors stay with us who also enjoy the area.

I will be strongly objecting to any development on this precious piece of land.

Yours sincerely,

Dear Robert,

I understand there is a consultation out re; Princess Parade. Now why on earth would one wish to build on the only piece of walkway in Seabrook and Hythe that most of the local community and other visitors from far and wide to visit and stroll along and enjoy the sea views etc . Let alone spend money in our beautiful town. The canal and the history behind it is fabulous with many books and articles in libraries as well as TV programmes. Do you wish Hythe and Seabrook to become a nonentity like the Dover seafront? This has been completely built up by developers which the local council have allowed in order to get money in the coffers. It would be criminal.

As a previous district councillor and town councillor I urgently ask you not to agree to this damaging build.

Good Afternoon, I have recently read that a development plan is being suggested for Princes Parade in Hythe, where can I see full details of the project being suggested so I can review and comment. Please advise. Thank You

Dear Mr Bliss

Thank you for your reply but I'm afraid I'm not impressed with Shepway's efforts. Quite a few of the people I met at the information stall on Saturday said they would not have known about it had I and others not done your publicity for you. Why did you choose the Express and not the Herald? I don't suppose many of the public regularly check the Shepway website. Did you try Tweeting it or putting it on Facebook?

I asked Jeremy Chambers to put posters in your noticeboards along the canal and also to use the mailing list from the Core Strategy consultation to let more people know about the Prince's Parade consultation but certainly the first didn't happen and as I didn't receive an email from Shepway I can only assume that the latter didn't happen either.

All this only reinforces the impression that most of the public has that Shepway don't really want us to know what is going on - as usual you are doing the bare minimum just so you can claim that you have consulted us.

The consultants tell me there will be more public consultation sessions in September so this will give you a chance to do more on the publicity front. After all you do have the balance of the £160k in the budget so I'm sure you could afford a few more posters.

Dear Mr Bliss

Given your recent comment "how is it wrong to ask the community what it wants us to do on its behalf?" I thought you might be interested to know how the Princes Parade consultation is progressing.

I knew about the public consultation sessions as I am a "stakeholder" but the only advertising by the consultants I have seen were the 2 ads in the Express (nothing in the Herald.) There were no posters in Seabrook where we would be the people most affected by any development and none in Hythe.

When I complained to the consultant (who otherwise seems to be doing a good job so I don't want to get him into trouble) he gave me some posters about the stall in the High St next Saturday to distribute in Seabrook. In the interest of democracy I did this as well as giving Hythe Town Council copies for their official noticeboards but it is rather galling to have to do this when the consultants are receiving such a hefty fee. I had already spent quite a lot of time informing people myself as I think it is extremely important that as many people know about this as possible.

Last Thursday's drop in session was in a little room at the back of Hythe Methodist Church which I didn't know existed. Apparently this is the local polling station but how would Seabrook residents know that? The consultants had set up a banner but again at the back of the church so you wouldn't know from the High St or even the front of the church that anything was going on.

Does anyone at Shepway actually monitor the consultants to see if they are fulfilling the terms of the contract in terms of public consultation?

Chris Capon has invited the consultants to a meeting of the Hythe forum but for weeks now nothing has been arranged and I suspect that this must be because of Shepway's apparent policy of not co operating with the Hythe Forum which is disappointing. I have given the consultant the contact details of the KCC officer making the arrangements.

All of the above suggest to me that Shepway isn't really interested in what the public thinks about Princes Parade but just wants to go through the motions so that it can tick the "consulted the public " box and then go ahead and do whatever it wants anyway.

Dear Mr Bliss

I am sorry if I am beginning to clog up your inbox but as you have no doubt realised I am very concerned about your proposed plans for Prince's Parade.

I have been trying to understand the rationale behind your suggestion that the new primary school be built there. As you know, Seabrook Primary School already has a site earmarked for the new building and it is

just lack of funds that have prevented the new school being built there. As education is the responsibility of KCC, I don't see that it would be possible for Shepway to make up this shortfall of funds from the proceeds of the sale of the land at Prince's Parade. So are you proposing that the school is paid for by s106 (or whatever it is now called) money from the developer? If that's the case then you must be considering a very large number of new homes and I think you need to be more honest with the public about what the plans would entail.

I look forward to receiving your explanation

Dear Mr Chambers

I know that you have said that your records show no sign of any munitions having been stored at Prince's Parade but I am hearing so many stories about this from so many different people that I am beginning to think there must be some truth in the rumours.

Can you please assure me that the consultants are doing a bit more than just looking through your records to establish the truth about this? If there is something there, the consequences of developing the site without first dealing with them doesn't bear thinking of.

Dear Mr Bliss

I am sorry to be contacting you again about this but I have been quite perturbed by your answer. How can a democratic council operate in this way? Is it even legal?

Can you at least give me some idea when these discussions took place and who was present?

I don't want to name them but there are some Shepway Councillors who didn't have the faintest idea about all this. What does that mean for the local people they are supposed to represent?

Dear Mr Bliss

Thank you for your reply.

I had a quick read of the constitution and if you are only talking about the appointment of consultants for £75000 then of course you have followed the rules.

However, the way I and other members of the public view the issue is that this about the whole future of the land at Prince's Parade not just a relatively small consultants' contract. Although it hasn't yet reached the stage where a monetary value can be placed on the project as a whole (which would trigger the rules laid out in the constitution), we feel that by appointing the consultants you are already more than half way to making the decision to go ahead with development. For us this is a "key" issue and I see nothing in the rules to say that you couldn't have discussed this project in full council and had the discussion minuted before rushing ahead and appointing consultants etc. It is just not acceptable that not even all the councillors were aware of something that could have such an impact on the whole area. I was present at a meeting in Hythe Town Hall in November 2010 when Alistair Stewart actually talked about putting the swimming pool and a new Seabrook School on the site so this has obviously been on your secret agenda for quite some time.

Can you please assure me that if the consultants come back and advise that development of the site is not feasible, you will accept that advice and leave the site alone? Or better still give it permanent protection as a piece of open space?

Dear Jeremy Chambers,

With regard to the future of Princes Parade why not follow the example set by Shepway planners (maybe you were involved??) with the fabulous coastal park on Folkestone's Lower Sandgate Road? The Folkestone development not only respects the unique natural beauty, the flora and fauna of the site but has managed to enhance and improve upon its attractions. Everyone I know, locals and visitors alike,

thinks its brilliant. It's user-friendly, especially popular with families and has really put Folkestone on the map.

Why not do something similar with Princes Parade? It's the perfect solution for this site and would add a whole new dimension to Hythe's existing attractions. To generate income the seafront car park (at Seabrook) would have to be enlarged and a charge made for parking there. A charge could also be made for parking on Princes Parade. Ideally, Princes Parade, like the Lower Sandgate Road, would no longer be a through road. In any case, in the interests of road safety a 20mph speed limit should be introduced to encourage cyclists and pedestrians to the area and cut down on car numbers.

If possible, I'd be grateful if you could keep me posted on this matter.

Kind regards,

Dear Jeremy,

As a result of information received from friends (for I saw neither of these events advertised) I attended both of the recent "public consultations" in Hythe which were, essentially, to determine how it would be possible (for a third time) for SDC to ignore the existing LDF & LP & Core Strategy & 2003 Public Enquiry classifications of the Princes Parade as LR9 public Leisure and Recreation Land, and to develop the site for housing. The desirability of this, from SDC's point of view is quite obvious: the receipt of significant capital sums from the sale of the land, the ongoing rate income from top rated sea side properties and the ability to claim credit for significant "community benefits" paid for by developers via s.106 contributions.

To classify these "public consultations" as fair, balanced and professional, even in the knowledge of SDC's consultative endeavours over the past decade is, perhaps, a "bridge to far". The reasons given for the said "necessity" to build an **unspecified** number of dwellings to fund, among other nebulous and **unspecified** community facilities, were (a) a Water Sports Centre; (b) a replacement for Sandgate primary school, and (c) a potential site for Hythe's existing Swimming Pool.

(a) Water Sports Centre: This is totally inaccurate - it has already been dealt with by SDC. Land allocated; leases for 99 years signed; irrelevant architectural competitions, designs and "Master Plans" paid for by the Seapoint Canoe Centre charity (£11,000) received, refused and returned to SDC, and funding in hand for the new build including s.106 agreements for £120,000. **The current apparent "requirement" for a water sports centre is causing much concern among the trustees of the Seapoint Canoe Centre - having already established, at considerable cost and effort over four years, that they are the ONLY body interested in a water sports facility in this location, they are now concerned that SDC are attempting to renege on existing undertakings.**

(b) Sandgate Primary School: Land for this is already allocated elsewhere in Folkestone. Funding for a new school is not (I understand) an SDC responsibility but that of Kent Education Authority. HMG approval on demographic grounds for a new school is highly unlikely.

(c) Hythe Swimming Pool: Why the rush to include this. If we await the result of yet another consultation on this issue (is it now the third?) in a weeks time we will, at least, have some information upon which to form some valid opinions.

My comment:

Opinions on unattributed 7.5 cm square sticky post-it notes; by people who are not provided with any information other than that which is, to say the least, *economical with the truth*; and who, in the majority, have little or no knowledge of either the background to current land classifications, planning legislation or the decisions of the the previous "professional" public enquiries into this specific issue are **irrelevant**. Also, to my own knowledge by speaking to those who filled in sticky comments, many were not even residents in Hythe but were tourists down for the day - "Yeah, a water sports centre a great idea, I bring my jet ski down from London at least once a month"!.

If these "comments" are, in any way, quoted in **any** consultation document and used by SDC for any purpose, **I have not the slightest doubt that their legality would be challenged.**

**I have, therefore, but ONE simple question:**

**Are the residents of Hythe going to be given ANY opportunity to record their views on this proposal and to question their elected councilors; with full and accurate information being provided by SDC; in a manner that the rate-payers of Hythe can have, at least, some confidence that the expenditure of £160,000 is justified; and that the supposed ideals of "open government" are fact rather than fiction. And if so, is it intended to make some attempt to advertise this.**

**Yours sincerely**

This area has always been used by wildlife and, historically, for walking and enjoying the environment. Please do not consider building there. Keep it as a coastal area with picnic locations and walkways. Allow your local residents to retain the beauty of the coast line. Invite families to spend the day with us. Reduce the amenities overload and save everyone money. I would happily help out. Just some clearance, picnic areas and even some paid parking, similar to Lower Sandgate Rd. No need for further play areas. Enjoy Hythe!. Houses would deter day visitors and cause complete havoc with traffic. Please, please do not build.

Having been residents in High Ridge for 25 years, we have used the Princes Parade and Canal walks throughout. We visit that area at least once a day, as do hundreds of other people. Previously, we were able to access the rough land by little footpaths. We used to pick mushrooms there during my younger days ( a long time ago). We aren't able to access the area any longer, but it has an abundance of wild life. Badgers, pheasants, small rodents and, not least of all, hunting birds. we stood so close to a kestrel the other day, it was wonderful. We take our grandchildren there to observe the beautiful butterflies etc. To build on this area would be a devastation. This area needs to be treated with respect. We need to extend the area as the coastal park. Make picnic areas, make footpaths, make it an exciting wonderland for families and children. No need to build a play area, just let nature take it's course. We can attract so many people to the area. Have an area for parking (income for the council). The Princes Parade promenade is never without walkers or cyclists. Whatever the weather, people visit there. Open up the rough area to compliment the coast line. Building more houses etc. would just erode what we have. A beautiful environment for both wild life and human life. I would be more than willing to help out with the clearing and nurturing and I am nearly 65. So many locals would feel the same way. We have enough properties being built on beautiful land, we really do not need this area to be destroyed. Please don't allow these property developers to take any more of our glorious coast line. Many thanks.

Dear Sir,

We reside and have lived at ....., Seabrook for some 30 years. We note from posted notices that comments are invited as to the possible uses of Princes Parade and that there was a consultation session in Hythe last Saturday. We were away and therefore unable to attend. Hence these comments by e - mail.

Like so many others, we vehemently oppose any development on the land. This is not simply a 'Nimby' type reaction. The stretch between Battery Point and the Hythe Imperial is one of the remaining areas of untouched land along this part of the Kent coast and, quite apart from issues as to wild life etc., it provides an open backdrop to the Seafront and a sense of airiness to the area. Over the years it has been used for recreation by the public- our own children used to tramp across it. The notices,

relatively recently erected by the Council denying entry (a fairly crass decision), only appeared, as we recall, after the application to have the area designated a village green. The open nature of the area also is an integral part of the pastoral (and historic) scene presented by the military canal, which is a national monument.

Coastal towns of the like of Hythe (and Folkestone) attract visitors and residents by virtue of their setting, gardens and open spaces more than anything else. Councils seem ever more determined to cover these with buildings /developments, sometimes, we think, for the sake and importance of a project to promote. Quite why it is necessary to spend £75000 on a consultation eludes us, save we suspect that it will prove self serving for those who are determined to 'do something'. The Golf course, we surmise, will eventually be next on the list for review.

What should happen is fairly obvious- the creation of paths and grassed areas with picnic tables etc so as to create a semi wild type parkland open to all. The only building/development that we see could be justified would perhaps be an extension of the childrens' play area to the East and next thereto, the building of modest facilities for visitors by way of toilets and maybe a small cafe/visitor centre. This would encourage use and enjoyment by all of the open space. The other alternative is to leave well alone!  
Yours faithfully,

There are dozens of extra sites for development other than Princes Parade. Yet you are wasting our money on this study. We will vote against any councillor who supports it. Remember ultimately you are accountable.

Dear Sir/Madam

I would like to offer my own personal views towards the future proposals for the development of Princes Parade (The former landfill site and Canoe Centre).

Having conducted numerous research myself, it is obvious that Hythe and it's local communities would benefit from a much larger community hall. Those currently available have the size restriction of approximately 80-100 people, thus dividing and restricting the development of many local social groups. Many European countries have grasped the potential of overnight tourist parking facilities, which themselves could be restricted to 1 or 2 night stop-overs, controlled by a suitable parking permit. Overseas sites offer toilet/washroom facilities, together with metered power outputs (for Electric cars also) as well as waste water disposal points. Local tourism would benefit tremendously, together with the development of a small regional Tourist Office with booking facilities. Interactive technologies could be used to promote regional leisure facilities.

The current site of the Seabrook Canoe centre that has been recently demolished, would offer a re-development area for suitable restaurants, shops, bars and relevant community offices.

The popularity of the beach together with the commercial housing development at the Imperial Green (western end) has given rise to significant parking problems along the seafront. Suitable traffic calming and more suitable parking and leisure areas areas, should also be a priority to this waste land site.

Whilst living in Egerton village I was responsible for the initial proposal for a new Millennium Community Hall with my colleague KCC Councillor Mr Richard King. 12 years ago we achieved a fund well in excess of £700,000, which was the catalyst for the development of numerous community societies based within this much valued facility. The administration was undertaken by numerous local volunteers under the supervision of the Egerton Parish Council.

As a retired broadcast TV & Film cameraman, I give talks to numerous local groups. I therefore feel that I am in touch with the future needs of Hythe and surrounding areas.

Kind regards

I am writing on this subject as a concerned local resident, directly affected by any proposed developments at Princes Parade. Although there was an opportunity to discuss this last Saturday 28 July, in Hythe High Street, the notice given for this was, in my view, totally inadequate. Apart from one notice pinned to a telegraph pole, half way along the private section of Cliff Road, I was able to find no other notification and have found no one who has seen any other notice. Significantly, there was no notice on the notice board by the post box in Cliff Road, opposite Cannongate Road nor any notices in the High Street or at any of the supermarkets.

I would hope that there will be other opportunities to discuss this prior to the consultants developing their report, so that there is an adequate feed-in of local views and not simply reactions to proposals that have already been made. Obviously, this is a sensitive site and any failure to make sure there has been adequate opportunity for the expression of views could well prejudice any outcome.

I would suggest that there is a need to repeat the open consultation exercise at the earliest time possible and for this to receive wide notification.

Please also keep me informed of further developments.

Dear Sirs,

I live at ..... and I have just learned about the proposals you have out for consultation on the redevelopment of the land along Princes Parade.

This email is to request further information please, but I would like to make a number of points which I hope you will record and feed into the consultation process:

1. I was unaware of the consultation, I did not receive a notification that the consultation was being held and it was only when I saw a notice stuck on a beach guard rail, that I became aware. By then my wife and I had missed the consultation events.
2. I cannot find what the proposals are, I understand there are some proposal to relocate the school there and the swimming pool, but I hope you will be able to give me a copy of the proposals in order for me to be consulted.
3. I do refer back to the last failed attempt by the council to obtain planning on this site and remake the three key points which I am wholeheartedly in agreement with:
  - a) Seabrook has little open green space and the Princes Parade open space is vital as an environmental haven for many species as well as its amenity value to the local community.
  - b) The site is toxic and contaminated and should be left undisturbed.
  - c) The land is an important flood defence providing a buffer between the sea and the canal, if buildings are put on the site and the sea washes over them, the sewerage systems will flood out onto the land and into the sea.

I hope you will very quickly forward to me the details in order for me to make my detailed comments but just in case this does not happen or cannot happen for some reason, can you please confirm that the Council has recorded and registered my views as a local rate payer.

Further to your email, I confirm that I would like to be kept updated on the plans for Princes Parade.

*Dear Sir/Madam*

*As a resident of Seabrook for more than thirty years whose house overlooks the canal and land on Princes Parade I feel I have to express my distress re: the proposed development of this land ..*

*This is a valued piece of open land which was available to walk and play on when we moved here until the council put up notices forbidding access and allowed it to become a wilderness.*

*However as a nature lover I appreciate its value as a natural habitat for an increasingly diverse amount of wildlife. This year I have seen in my garden for the first time green woodpeckers and long tailed tits as just a small example.*

*We have already had, in 2004, a report stating that dwellings on this site would be "unacceptably disruptive and harmful to the attractive open character of Princes Parade".*

*In addition there are notices put in place along that part of the canal by the council stating that, following their receiving a £3.5million grant from Heritage Lottery Fund for future development and management of the Royal Military Canal, their long term aim is to enhance the understanding and enjoyment of the area as a heritage, tourism, ecological and recreational asset.*

*To this end the notice also states: a dedicated environment officer was appointed in 2004 to work on habitat enhancement for 10yrs to improve ecological diversity and landscape.*

*I do not think a proposed housing development on this open land next to the canal sits very comfortably with the councils own stated aims for the future of the canal and local wildlife.*

*We fought in the past to get the canal listed as an ancient monument/site of historical importance to prevent previous development plans which would have destroyed the canal in this area.*

*Please leave this valued open space for the local people and the wildlife.*

Regards

Could you please keep me advised on your proposals for any development plans for the land along Prince's Parade. I am aware that the council has solicited bids from consultants to progress planning permission for this area of land. As a owner of property along Seabrook Road I am appalled that the council sees fit to use our council tax for this when it is abundantly clear from previous proposals that any development of this land is completely against the wishes of an overwhelmingly vast majority of the taxpayers in the area.

Yours sincerley

Thank you.....

I see that it is a 'projected 'use so actual detail is not available.

Having reviewed the history I have ask to who doesn't understand the word 'NO' ? made very clear in what would appear to have been the result of numerous previous, and no doubt expensive reports.

Does a British City Council order new reports until they get the answer they want? We are used to a different

jurisdiction.

Please advise.

Regards

Hi!

Steve was busy suspect stuck to the post its!

One Question:

Does Shepway need to sell a portion of the land to a developer to build homes to fund any other development on the P.P. site?

Pl. advise.

THX

Hi!

I am used to dealing in the real world! unless Shepway have a war chest unknown to the property tax payers then it is obvious to me at least! that you would need a developer to purchase a portion of the land. I know from the oceans of information about Core strategy and LDF that the law/rules would have to change to allow this a difficult and long winded expensive! process.I think the public would be much

better served if they were treated like adults and your 'hypothetical' scenario presented to them instead of housing being presented by your consultants as an option!. I also found the remaining list of 'options' having read much of the historical documentation to be unrealistic goals and frankly unimaginative. To 'sell' the project I think you are going to not only admit to needing funding, but also to inspire with a much broader program. If you let me have the consultants email I'll be happy to forward these observations to them.

Hopefully you are not offended! and will keep in touch!.

Regards

Hi Steve,

Thanks for your e. as you were tied up I visited with Louise tell her Hi! and no, I did not feel missed out?! I did however comment that I think your list of options (is it your list?) lacked imagination.. in my opinion. looks like this is being reviewed. Surely the cost to clean up the site sufficiently to accommodate a school and a pool would be unrealistic bearing in mind the lack of funds.

By the way I also spoke to a few people and actually they were NOT told that the project would have to be funded by selling part of the land to a developer, this must be spelt out. As you can see from my emails to Jeremy it comes as no surprise to me. I am not against all development, however, I am against all the prime sites being sold off, also land banking. There are far too many sites with planning permission around Hythe not being built on, including one below our home, still empty after four years!. So exactly how much residential accommodation does Hythe really need? Imperial Green has sold TWO, and the promised affordable homes are not yet built!

One immediate question I have is bearing in mind the constraints already on the property with regard to the building of homes how can that be reversed? have approaches been made to HMG?

Keep in touch.

Dear Sir/madam,

I recently contributed to the discussion about possible future development on Princes Parade. Many family and friends share my belief that, if it is to be developed at all, the land on Princes Parade has huge potential for the establishment of a coastal marina that would benefit the entire area on a permanent basis. The creation of a marina here has been a regular consideration since at least the 1970s and should be looked at seriously. If housing is built on this land this opportunity for Hythe will be lost for ever. I was asked if I would be prepared to be involved in future consultations. I am happy to be involved and will assist in any way that I can.

Best Wishes,

Dear Sir/Madam,

With regard to the possible development on Princes Parade, my family and I all believe that if there is to be any building there it should be based around the building of a sea lock to create a marina for the Town. This would provide permanent income from resident and visiting mariners as well as significant local employment. If you look at Sovereign Harbour at Eastbourne this has totally re-vitalised the entire area around Eastbourne attracting major retailers and thousands of visitors. It would actually be worth Shepway contacting the creators of Sovereign Harbour as they would provide an excellent template for demonstrating how to achieve sustainable regeneration of an area.

In the 1970s a Hythe sea lock at the canal outfall at Battery Point was proposed, this would have seen boats come into the canal for mooring, this idea is still viable although not ideal. Perhaps a better approach would be that proposed by private developers, pre- the credit crunch, to create a water filled basin with sea lock access and residential housing around the waterfront (as at Sovereign Harbour). There is massive demand for marinas along the South

Coast and there is no coverage between the spartan facilities at Dover and Eastbourne which is a long way away and round Dungeness Point. A marina at Hythe would be hugely popular and would generate income for the area on an ongoing basis.

If you allow development to be just residential homes you will not only prevent any future marina development you will permanently stifle a location that should be the economic dynamo for the whole area. Apart from the odd Tea Hut or Ice Cream van little is done to use the presence of visitors to Princes Parade to stimulate the local economy. Visionary, imaginative and creative planning now could change that with a marina becoming a destination location. The investment required will be recouped many times over.

I would urge the planning decision makers not to seek a quick one-off influx of cash from residential development and instead to seek a long term means of generating income for our town.

Sir

I can see no reason for the area of "common land" on Princes Parade to be developed other than to make Shepway Council a lot of money. I walk along the canal bank there with my dog most days and it is obvious the whole area is teeming with wildlife, the plants provide the habitat and food for the insects that in turn become the food of the fish in the canal, there are also so many different types of birds nesting there. Yesterday as I walked along the seafront there I saw a hen pheasant and her three chicks working their way along the margins of the area feeding...just tell me how many places in this country enable a person to see and hear the beautiful pheasants while walking by the sea.

I believe that the RSPB and Nature Conservancy should be consulted and their view taken very seriously. And should the worst happen and it is built on - where are the extra school places, doctors, hospital beds etc going to come from?

Leave it alone please

Regards

Dear Sir,

**Re: Land at Princes Parade, Seabrook and Hythe**

Unfortunately, my wife and I were unable to attend the meeting held at Seabrook Hall on last Monday evening. However we want to make our thoughts and concerns clear in this letter.

We are concerned that allowing any kind of building development at the above will ultimately be a green light for building on the whole of Marine Parade including the golf course.

We understand the piece of land in Seabrook is home and habitat for a lot of wild life that includes badgers, reptiles, many types of birds and insects that the birds feed on. Nature has taken over this area and should therefore be left in a natural state to allow the ecology to establish itself. A nature walk would be as much as would be acceptable here. What are weeds to some is habitat to many.

The problems of building houses on Princes and Marine Parades are manifold and once built there is no going back. The area of level land between the escarpment that runs around the rear of Hythe and the sea is not very wide. Building, houses or anything else, on this area would be wrong because of the following reasons:-

(Not in any specific order)

1. Water. Hythe has suffered from lack of water from dry summers for a number of years. This area was the last in having its hosepipe ban lifted this year.

2. Hythe has suffered from flooding in the past, particularly the area between Seabrook Road and the sea.

3. Because of the lowness of the area there would be more air pollution and noise pollution. (We are only too acutely aware that motorcyclists use Seabrook Road and Princes Parade as a racetrack particularly late at night and early in the mornings).

4. Building close to the sea would introduce unwanted light pollution.

5. Petty crime and lawlessness is a problem in this area. We ourselves have suffered damage to our property on two occasions and we have only lived here five years.

Unfortunately, the Police Office in Hythe High Street was closed just a few weeks ago. We never see a police person except when speeding along our road with sirens and lights blazing. In other words this area is under policed and vulnerable.

6. In our opinion the tract of land between Seabrook and the Hythe Imperial is precious open space, where, in old advertising speak 'Hythe - Where the countryside meets the sea'. Visitors enjoy coming here to soak up the uniqueness, history, and openness of the area. Humans need respite from concrete and hubbub. It should be made into a nature conservation area.

7. Facilities in the area, because of its topography of the landscape will never be sufficient to meet the needs of all the new developments already approved (Nichols Quarry, Fisherman's Beach, etc). Another large development will only make matters even worse.

8. The accesses to the Hythe are poor, mainly due to the geography of the area. Traffic has become a very real problem in the approaches to Hythe especially Hythe Hill since the Sainburys store was opened. Some Sunday mornings the traffic is nose to tail all the way up past Pedlindge and beyond.

9. Parking is problematic. Car parks are few and exceedingly expensive (£1.20p for one hour or less).

This does not benefit the shopkeepers in the town and encourages shoppers to use edge of town supermarkets with their free parking. Lack of cheap parking then creates its own problems within High Streets. It slowly kills them making councils spend vast sums of money on regeneration projects.

10. There are only two doctors' surgeries in Hythe and one has to take into account the high percentage of elderly people and retirement homes in the town. More residents here would put an enormous burden on our doctors and medical staff. (I am having to wait two weeks to have a growth on my face checked out - this cannot be right). The nearest emergency hospital at Ashford is a good fifteen miles away.

11. Ironically, the golf club house at the Imperial Hotel has been closed ostensibly through lack of membership. The effect has been that what membership they did have has virtually disappeared. We believe this is a cynical attempt by the owners to convince the planners that the golf course is only good enough to build on. That is little short of madness. However, there are times in good weather when many golfers can be seen enjoying a game.

12. We are being told by central government that we should endeavour to become less lethargic, take up a sport and keep fit. The golf course should remain a golf course and schools should be encouraged and invited to bring our next generation of golfers to try their hand at golf and maybe a small golf range could be introduced to help with teaching. Golf, apparently, is to be a new discipline for the next Olympic Games.

13. It must be said that property in Hythe is expensive for the benefit of being near the sea or having sea views. The council tax bands reflect that privilege. However, if new high buildings along the frontage diminish the views etc, their rateable values will probably fall and any new build will not cover the reductions.

14. The land at the Seabrook end of Marine Parade was formerly a council rubbish dump. It subsequently had the spoil from the canal dumped on top when the canal was re-dredged some years ago. The land is therefore all 'filled' necessitating piling for any buildings constructed upon it. Because of the nature of the fill the Environmental Agency will require a full investigation into the nature of this fill and can decide that it should all be removed and dumped somewhere else. The number of lorry movements would be quite unacceptable on the surrounding roads with their current traffic loads.

15. Any buildings will require their lower storeys to be kept uninhabitable because they are on a floodplain plan. To make such a restriction economic the buildings would have to be three or more storeys high.

16. From past experience when Councils say that they require some 'enabling development' it means the local facilities will meagerly funded and leave the councilors a lot of unbudgeted money to spend on their pet projects just before the next election. These projects are only of a mediocre need and become very low priority after the elections are over.

Other points about this Consultation.

- A. It was reported in the local press recently that one councilor had stated that the council were going to allow building because it would raise some 'easy cash'. In view of that remark the appointment of 'Consultants' look to be a cynical move by the council in an attempt to avoid the wrath of the voting public. Any decision they make will be based on the recommendations of the 'Consultants'. The consultants will only recommend what the council want to hear (or it would be doubtful that they would get another consultancy with Shepway Council).
- B. The council seems to be able to easily find the £75000 cost of the consultants when other matters in the area need addressing.
- C. It also raises the question what are the vast sums paid to the Planning Department used for. Planning is their job they should be doing it in house. Professional planners are quite able to prepare unbiased reports for their councilors. They do it every month for the Planning meetings.
- D. The consultations should not be used to bring in other contentious issues along the Marine Parade frontage. The subject of parking and parking meters has already been dealt with by the council and should not be resurrected as an afterthought through the 'consultation process'
- E. It was shameful that no Shepway District councilor could be bothered to turn up at the meeting at Seabrook. If they really understood the feelings of the electorate it would have served them well to have attended. As it is it would appear they have already decided the route this matter is going down and the 'consultation' is just to make the public record look authentic.
- F. In a democratic society the voices of the people of Seabrook and Hythe must be heard, respected and adhered to. The area from the Imperial Hotel to Seabrook Garage should be declared permanent open space and kept as open space for the benefit of this generation and the generations to come.

Yours sincerely,

In no particular order my comments are:-

- This Public Consultation is a cynical exercise by the council to inveigle the people of Hythe into believing they have some jurisdiction over the fate of their Town.
- The council want to make a decision that it knows will not be welcome by the local ratepayers. To ease this dilemma they employ 'Consultants' rather than use in house planning staff.
- This exercise is all about the council generating some easy cash. It will then waste that cash on trivia. EG:-
  - More unwanted signs.
  - Unwanted Notice boards.
  - More restrictions pushing trade from area into the super markets with their free parking or to other towns all together.
- The council's current strategy is slowly but surely killing the assets the town has to offer. A quaint personalised High Street with green space down to the sea.
- Hythe's motto 'Where country meets the sea'. What is happening to that?
- The area between Hythe Imperial Hotel and Seabrook garage should be left as open space.
- If built on it would turn Hythe into a concrete jungle. At the moment large areas of Hythe enjoy open vistas of Hythe Bay. These would be lost.
- Loss of wild life habitat – weeds to a few but habitat to a lot of others.
- Seabrook end was a corporation tip after the war. Environmental Department will want all contaminate soil removed and dumped elsewhere creating a huge number of lorry movements.
- Ground is made up and will require piling.
- Any buildings will require the habitable areas above the flood plain making any buildings even higher.
- There are already adequate approvals in place for additional housing that are not being taken up (Nichols Gravel pit) etc.
- Open area should be used to extend golf course, create park land or gardens, or left as a wild life refuge – pheasants, magpies, pigeons, tits and other small birds, foxes, frogs, toads, etc.
- The golf course should be designated a permanent open area to stop building in the future.
- No parking meters on Marine Parade - unsightly, costly and unnecessary. This council grossly over charges for parking and will deter visitors.
- A couple of years ago an application was made to the appropriate Department in London to have the area declared open space. The council objected to this. We now know why.
- Any development would increase the strain on already limited resources:-
  - Water (hose pipe ban last to come off)
  - Schooling
  - Health and hospitals
  - Road network
  - Law enforcement

If the council wish to spend some money they could:-

- Existing gravel path along side the canal requires reshaping to remove deep puddles in wet weather.

See list of addresses at end of letter

6<sup>th</sup> September 2012

1. **OPPOSITION TO DEVELOPMENT OF PRINCES PARADE SEABROOK**
2. **COMPLAINT ABOUT PUBLIC CONSULTATION**
3. **COMPLAINT ABOUT NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM ON 20<sup>TH</sup> AUGUST 2012**

Dear Sir/Madam,

1. **Opposition to development of Princes Parade Seabrook**

I would like to state my opposition to any development on Princes Parade, Seabrook. I understand that in the past, the site has been used as a rubbish tip and as a result the unstable ground will contain unknown pollutants and poisons. I am very concerned that if the ground is disturbed toxic gases will be released into the environment.

Princes Parade is the only piece of land in East Hythe along the coast, available to the public that has not been built on (I do not include the Imperial Hotel golf course) and any development will change the unique character of the area.

2. **Complaint about public consultation regarding Princes Parade**

I and it seems many others were unaware of the public consultations in Hythe on 19<sup>th</sup> July and 28<sup>th</sup> July 2012. Surely it would have been better to consult the people of Seabrook in Seabrook. I feel that the results of these consultations will be flawed because the majority of those interviewed do not live in the area concerned.

3. **Complaint about Neighbourhood Forum on 20<sup>th</sup> August 2012**

I only found out about the meeting when a leaflet was put through my door.

It is difficult to know where to start. I have never been to a council meeting before and sincerely hope others are not conducted in this manner. It was shambolic and farcical from beginning to end. The behaviour of the chairman, Mr Capon, was disgraceful.

I understand that the consultants engaged by Shepway District Council are meant to be 'top drawer'. Unfortunately, the representative from the firm was unable to give a visual presentation (which was going to be projected onto what looked like a bed sheet) because of a fault with the equipment. Initially I and others were unable to hear what he said, he was then handed a microphone but it was still difficult to hear him. What I could hear seemed to be in jargon and not in words that an ordinary person would understand.

Mr Capon was antagonistic to the audience and rude to the female councillor sitting to his right, I do not know her name. The main reason the public were agitated was because Mr Capon seemed unable to give a straight answer to any question put to him and his attitude would best be described as belligerent. The majority of the audience seemed to be frustrated by Mr Capon's continual refusal to give details of who to contact to oppose any development of the area by Shepway District Council. When the councillor (to his right) tried to tell the audience who specifically they should contact, Mr Capon aggressively grabbed the microphone from her. I am still shocked by his behaviour. He should be ashamed of himself.

Yours sincerely,

Copy to:  
Damian Collins MP  
Louise Mansfield – Allies and Morrison  
Robert Bliss – Shepway District Council  
Jeremy Chambers – Shepway District Council  
Keren Belcourt – Local Councillor  
David Owen – Local Councillor  
Christopher Capon – Shepway District Council

to whom it may concern

I am strongly opposed to any plans to develop the area of land on Princess Parade.

There are very few undeveloped areas beside the Kent coast which are able to provide a natural habitat & for this reason the land should be left undisturbed.

It is aesthetically pleasing to have this area as it is with a view inland to the hills & the sea on the other side for people to enjoy a bit of space & timelessness.

I cannot attend today as I'm working in my shop in Folkestone where I, like many others, are struggling. Shepway Council could have better supported the community we have with this £75,000 rather than squandering it for short-term gain with this project.

## PRINCES PARADE - FACE THE FACTS

The Hythe Marina project is, mercifully, a dead duck. Among much else, it would have entailed 500 housing units, eleven blocks of seafront flats and the distortion of the historic Royal Military Canal etc. But a House of Commons Select Committee decided otherwise despite the Shepway-backed developments, their top QC and eight expert witnesses. The 13-day transcripts are in the public domain and the facts are still relevant today.

Now, housing on the 18-acre Princes Parade unique site, has reared its ugly head again in the guise of **enabling housing**. It purports to enable a new KCC Primary School with playground in place of <sup>the</sup> antiquated one in Seabrook, and also replace the present run-down Hythe swimming pool, while other sites are available. The housing is destined for a **so-called brownfield site** whose toxic level maybe crucial.

At a Shepway cost of £75,000, top consultants are now carrying out the statutory, democratic consultations in the absence of full briefing (**I can't** ~~write~~) ~~by~~ the District Council. Even a top Councillor doesn't know his onions! The next keyword is **neutralisation**, the modern method of dealing with toxicity. Costwise, timewise, healthwise ~~to~~ are unknown and should be a priority. <sup>healthwise</sup>

**Brownfield site**, for a start, is another dubious word to justify the exercise. It first came to my notice at the local Enquiry ~~in 2003~~ (2003) into the Shepway Policy Plan to 2011. Folkestone and Hythe, two distinct urban areas, geographically and historically, with a lovely green lung in between and each with its own Mayor is defined as

a single urban area by virtue of being linked by the residential Seabrook Road. **HYTHESTONE** you might say, despite the obvious inconsistencies.

Before the cascade of opinion, it should be remembered that the seafront area in question was purchased by Hythe B.C from the S.E. Railway Co. in 1935, with a loan from the Ecclesiastical Commission for the purpose of **Public Walks and Pleasure Grounds**, with sanction from the Ministry of Health. After the war when it had been a Defence Area, tank traps etc. followed by a risk of **flooding** by the breacher in the sea defences, and later the breakdown of the Hythe incinerator **NECESSITY** decreed otherwise. By 1974 the area was swallowed up by Shepway and, according to signboards, had reverted to its original purpose. (see transcripts). Its public footpaths and bridleway, its history of national importance are paramount, but ignored.

The Chairmen of the House of Commons Select Ctee, after a strictly private visit to the Princes Parade site in the context of the whole area, said on Day 12 of the hearing 'I found this site absolutely fascinating ... with the various wild flowers, looking at birds and what we saw in the site ... it just happened to make me very happy to see it.' He speaks for most of us, far and near.

Hands off Princes Parade. Improve its recreational purpose, please, by all means.

Simon Finlay Esq  
Editor, Folkestone Herald  
Westcliff Terrace, Folkestone

Delivered by hand  
14/07/12

Dear Mr Finlay, - This reply is factual and important and I trust it will appear, as is, as soon as possible.

#### PRINCE'S PARADE CALLS OUT FOR RECREATION

My sympathies are with Brian Goodchild and the jobless problems that blights young lives (letters 12.7.2012)

The answer to his Hythe Marina lament is simple and requires few words

ea-linked The proposed sea-linked Marina centred on Shepway's Prince's Parade site required a lock gate, an outer harbour and a Private Bill to do so.

Promoters of the Bill (J.S. Bloor Ltd) supported by Shepway P.C. had unlimited means to engage a top QC and eight expert witnesses.

A House of Commons Select Committee, two Labour and two Conservative, after a 13 day hearing and a private visit turned the Bill down by three votes to one. The committee was also aware that the overall development of the 14 hectare site would entail the removal of a vast tonnage of toxic waste.

Civil Ch. Gill Engineer, led by the Seabrook Association assisted by John Gill, it should be noted that The Sandgate Society was only one of many official bodies to be involved, and proud of it.

As long ago as 1999, the protection of <sup>this</sup> ~~an~~ important

Heritage site and its recreational potential was officially recognised and could and should be activated.

The transcripts can be consulted in the Heritage Room, Folkestone Library if they can be of help to Brian Goodchild and other interested parties. Visionaries please get real.

### Railing locals

IN RESPONSE to your article regarding the removal of railings (Herald, June 28), I think the town looks better without them but I would be naive in thinking that's the main reason for the removal, as the council will be able to reclaim the costs for the scrap metal, I am sure. I do believe not all the railings should have been removed as per your article.

An instance here is New Street, where the safety barrier should be replaced at the top of the road where all the lorries, cars and buses swerve round a tight bend - the two houses above me are directly in line should there be a vehicle coming off the road.

We have already had a young cyclist who did just that, going into the wall at the front of the house and he had to go to hospital to be checked over. The barrier would have stopped him going off the road, but might have hurt a bit!

Margaret Noble

### Sands of time

WE HAVE Kent County Council, Shepway District Council, Folkestone and Hythe town councils and one can only wonder why we need so many councillors. They seem to delight in allowing developers to put up more and more housing - squeezing it in wherever they can, even if it interferes with others' privacy.

There is much more to looking after Folkestone than building. Having lived in this area for most of my life, I have watched the decline of Folkestone over a number of years.

It began when some bright spark wanted to cut off the arms and legs of Folkestone town.

The pedestrianisation of Guildhall Street was supposed to be a "trial". It has never improved footfall in the town - in fact, just the opposite.

The compulsory buying up of businesses in and around Alexander Gardens led to a 16-year wait for a new shopping centre. We finally got a "wind tunnel".

The one natural amenity which has stood the test of time is Folkestone Sands, but even there, the powers that be saw fit to allow developers to build a block of flats right next to it.

Instead of crazy golf, bingo, fruit machines, a decent cafe and restaurant, beach shops, ice cream parlours etc, we now have one black building (cannot tell what it is until it opens) which sells novelties and another black building along the top of the sands which I am told is a cafe. To the sands themselves. There were beer bottles, cans, condoms, paper cups and goodness what else in every arch.

Several visitors came to use the sands and were disgusted. Four from up north - they had visited when they were young - never even spread their towel, while a dad with his daughter from Maidstone and many others we spoke to could not

believe how filthy and strewn with litter it was.

They didn't go back and say what a lovely model of the mermaid - they said what disgustingly dirty and dangerous sands. Also there was no first aid hut or lifeguard like there used to be.

It seems to me that one "entrepreneur" after another has been in charge of much of Folkestone.

A lot of our money has gone into Tontine Street and High Street but we have a natural amenity that doesn't take much to keep clean and makes it inviting for families. Folkestone has always been a bucket-and-spade town, we have the beach and the sands so you councillors get and shape up the Sunny Sands and go some way to restoring what it used to be. You cannot blame the Channel Tunnel, or the lack of ferries. The sands are still there and one of the best things about Folkestone that does not cost a lot of money. Stop outsourcing everything and let the council taxpayers have the profits instead to go to the forgotten places of Folkestone, or use the £25,000 you are spending for when the Olympic Torch passes through. Shouldn't you be listening to people?

A Eatwell, Hythe

### Ode to odious

Many financial institutions these days invest foolishly driven by greed. They're playing with fire in many ways and in the long term can't succeed. The big banks managed with ease to bring recession to our door, forcing this country to its knees, which we can't forgive or ignore. They were to blame of course with others who came on board, and with greed as a irresistible force rich pickings were always assured. Financial experts had a good idea of the current market trend, yet no one bothered to make it clear that the boom was about to end. If there's an honest banker about step forward and reveal your name; the financial fraternity will no doubt be pleased if you shoulder the blame. In hindsight we can now assess



READER I Featherbe these pari gloomy-ic pansies ir garden la He wro look at m guys, it's fault then rain!"

their gamble was doomed to fail, and as it's a criminal offence with no redress, why aren't these people in jail?

Joe Thomas, Sandgate Writers

### Stern ripostes

A MARINA on Princes Parade? (Your Views, June 28). What a splendid idea, Mr Raymond. No doubt this will provoke stern ripostes from surviving members of the Sandgate Society team who successfully campaigned against a similar proposal several years ago.

However, I suggest that their heroic, well-meaning efforts may well have done the locality a mighty disservice. Too often, throughout the crumbling Folkestone area, a promising scheme which would have provided employment opportunities has triggered reflex opposition. Older readers may recall Sydney de Haan's idea for a marina at Copt Point, and Center Parcs' plans for their first UK venture at West Wood, Lyminge. Both could have resulted in desperately needed jobs.

We all need to be more open-minded and sympathetic towards any sensible proposals for regeneration which might improve the prospects for those unlucky enough to be young.

Brian Goodchild Sandgate High Street

### Dump barrage

RE: AIRPORTS and nuclear waste. I cannot remain silent when I read the barrage of questions from Mr Godfrey of Lyminge. Open debate is a privilege of democracy, not a waste of taxpayers' money. Among us are distinguished physicists, geologists and environmentalists who regard Romney Marsh as a unique place on this planet.

"Even" the invertebrates are special and surely we should protect this haven. In the short term, the search for employment is understandable, but remember that historically across the world jobseekers have migrated and survived. The Marsh, once abused, will perish. The flora and fauna will perish with it.

Consider the future for our children, their children and

generations to come... intricate life could survive us but we cannot survive the variety of other for

When asked "is air development and the nuclear waste accept husband's response is simple, ask yourself is wrong - and it's wrong And I agree with him Zoe P

### Ghost-wri

HAVING just read with article in the Folkestone regarding the sighting Spitfire by Jaeden Win e-mailing to advise the Seabrook and saw the accompanied by two h from my garden, on the the time stated.

I have seen the Spitf helicopters on several recent weeks. From what can see Shornecliffe B: the sea on my right an appears to come in fro barracks. It appears to few rolls and then after view for a few minutes makes its way back on barracks in a direction take it west of Folke

As someone with a in the last war, includir of Britain, I have been see the Spitfire as I ca any particular annivers time of year to warrant appearance.

On the day in questi Spitfire had passed ov direction of the M20 as from recent sightings I reappear, I went to my my binoculars.

Shortly after and tru reappeared from the d: M20 and made its way the helicopters from wh came. I watched it throu binoculars until it disapp view.

I can only assume that possibly a private owner, the aircraft up for pleasur could perhaps be returnir somewhere like Manston even further afield.

Richard Giggs,

For the attention of Chris Hall, QVA  
10 Stratton Street, London W1A 8JR

22 Oct 2012

Subject: Prince's Parade, Hythe. Consultation.

With no due respects, please permit me to say that your so-called Consultation has got off to a very poor start, unworthy of a prestigious consultant at taxpayer's expense (£75,000)

Poor publicity, i.e. Methodist Ch. Hythe R.S.V.P. in July. Sticky notes at a stand in Hythe High Street (July 27. I found it only by chance.

Poor Homework Steve Welton's ignorance of essential background. Betrayed a total ignorance of House of Commons Select Ctee (13 days + strictly private visit.) Their appraisal and findings still relevant today. Jeremy Chambers knew nothing of it till I brought it to his attention.

Historic Background an area of Nationwide importance not just Hythe's back yard. See my evidence to Public Inquiry 1987 and 2003. Even local MP did not know it was a Scheduled Ancient Monument which, together with Hadrian's Wall and Offa's Dyke are the three most important linear defence works in the UK.

So far, it has been a load of eye wash. I for one, demand facts before opinions. And facts divide themselves roughly into three.

- 1) Environmental Assessment and Feasibility, (costwise, timewise, healthwise.)
- 2) Public Amenity.
- 3) Urban Sprawl.

Advisability, desirability, permissibility comes next.

So for you are putting the cart before the horse and I, for one, am not impressed.

Steve Walker also spoke of 'improving access' I said whatever for. There were 3 town bridges N to S. already. He said needed in the other direction.!! (i.e E to W).

SW should know there are two Public Footpaths one of which is also a bridleway. They only need a tidy-up by Shepway and a signpost or two.

I have photos and background information which I will reveal only when the time is ripe.

Magic words such as 'enabling' and 'neutralizing' of toxic infill were lacking at Hythe Forum. How many test borings will be needed - at what cost? THIS MUST BE A PRE-CONDITION before other action taken.

Answer required as to the current prices obtainable (for development) for the site of present Hythe Swimming pool and Kee Primary School at Seabrook.

Transparency is needed before a load of quibble.

Yours unashamedly

On a wet, windy day in June 1985, I came from New York to look at a house for sale in Sandgate. It was a nostalgic journey, a return for the first time in twenty years to a favourite spot. I drove via Tenterden, Romney Marsh and Hythe, and as I drove along Princes Parade towards Sandgate I could hardly believe it - nothing had happened, nothing had been done to that wonderful stretch of land and road and promenade and sea that I remembered so well. I stopped, got out for just a minute. I was late. I went on to Sandgate and bought my house.

The most remarkable quality of the site we are discussing is that its beauty is not essentially natural; it is as if it has been waiting for a hundred years for something else to happen but, wonder of wonders, nothing has, and here we have what must be a unique coastal situation. It is deeply beautiful. Its natural qualities seem to be almost entirely overlooked and underused. It is a wonderful place to walk, with or without dogs, along the promenade with access to the beach where wanted, among the grass and wildness of the land, along the canal bank. It has an openness, a spirit, so accessible to all of us.

The value of this place as it is is priceless. The Marina scheme will simply destroy it. It will create nothing more interesting than more of the boring mediocrity of the housing schemes with which we are already saturated. Above all, the space will go, the parade which goes somewhere will go, and what will certainly in the future be appreciated as one of our greatest assets, will be gone. And all this in the name of a marina which could be situated with great sensitivity and liveliness in Folkestone itself.

Submitted at  
Hythe Forum Meeting.

20.8.2012

House of Commons Select Ctee (Hythe Marina)  
June, July 1990 – 13 days  
See LRM Sandgate History pages 47 and 48

Seabrook Assn. Led by Bernard Binns.  
Supported, among many others, by Geoffrey Edmunds, Agent for Sandgate  
Society.

Transcripts available in Heritage Room, Folkestone Public Library.

Select Ctee: Mr John Cummings in the Chair (L)  
Mr Ian Bryce (C) 4h  
Mr David Clelland (L)  
Sir Trevor Skeet (C)

Much evidence of interest today.

Day 2. Shepway Notice Boards (post 1974) announcing Princes Parade area as  
pleasure grounds. See also maps.

Day 5. Reference to footpaths and bridleway

Day 6. Infill, contamination, costs in general (also Army rights. P.S.A.)

Day 7. Residence loss of sea views, property values, access to amenities

Day 12. Following strictly private visit of Ctee, 28 June 1990, Chairman says 'I  
found the site absolutely fascinating... wild life etc'

Day 13. Binns lawful right to sum up. Loss of amenity land, historical significance,  
wildlife, views etc

Note Shepway remiss in their briefing in not bringing background to attention of  
Consultants. Quite unknown to Steve Walker and Louise Mansfield (Allies  
and Morrison).

## Princes Parade, Hythe Public Consultation July 2012

This is a verbatim transcript of the comments made at public consultation events, which do not represent the views or recommendations of Allies and Morrison Urban Practitioners.

### What are the key issues for Princes Parade which could affect its future?

1. Tourism jobs – people come here for what we have to offer. We are different – we are NOT overdeveloped.
2. If this is about building a pool build the pool first or at the same time.
3. Global warming and rising sea levels – low flood risk assessment don't think so!
4. You can't put a price on views or beauty
5. Is this a way of getting a new school paid for??
6. Canal and developer greed.
7. Preferred options we do not want it
8. Open up as nature reserve for visitors and locals alike.
9. Council would like to build houses on area the opposite of what local people need.
10. No buildings on site.
11. Don't trust English Heritage or the council.
12. Shepway DC have been negligent in not keeping this maintained and open for use.
13. This is another money making opportunity for SDC.
14. Princes Parade – not an ideally accessible location for a pool, esp for young people.
15. Parties should be aware that there is a large amount of live ordnance buried on this site – MOD should be involved
16. If you don't know what to do with the land – 'Build on it' what an epitaph! Leave it alone it's great as it is.
17. Re Council do not consider what the local community would like building houses would affect rest people in Seabrook.
18. Poor location for sports pitch – too exposed.
19. I understand that not all land is owned by Stepway – who owns it?
20. Another green space eliminated for concrete. What about wildlife!!
21. Doesn't the landfill make it impossible / difficult for a school or homes to be built there?
22. Land was gifted some years ago for leisure, for the people of Hythe. Housing and individual units not within this remit.
23. SAM consent was granted for previous development.
24. The site was bequeathed as open space for the community.
25. Maintain use by public of entire area without development of houses when numerous other sites are more feasible and less intrusive for house development.
26. People welcome well designed quality development, but not tawdry development. Affordable doesn't need to be bad – Port Sunlight is a good eg.
27. It is the ONLY place where NATURE IS KING! No penthouse flats for Londoners.
28. Will leave no open space for the future.
29. Concerned about the cost of clearing the site – wouldn't that make development prohibitively expensive?
30. Any development would assist private dev and the gov of course which would be HUGE – do we want to set this precedent?
31. Any proposal for a hard development at the Eastern end of Princes Parade is contrary to the existing Local Area Plan.
32. Over development and the selling off of the unique land along the front.

33. Issues: Interest to make money. Disregard for need for leisure, wildlife, conurbation with Folkestone.
34. People come/move to Hythe because it is quirky and different to elsewhere.
35. Lots of illegal dumping on this site in the 70's. Dumping ended in 1972.
36. Build on it! Change it! Don't fix it till it's broken leave it.
37. Shepway and Hythe need to talk and need to be efficient.
38. To use an asset to benefit of all.
39. Bloor have previously promoted a scheme with Shepway.
40. Destruction of natural habitat enclosure, commercialisation, loss of common rights, loss of open prospect.
41. Shepway greed.
42. Additional traffic and noise if any development goes ahead.
43. The land was bought from the church commissioners for the purpose of public walks and pleasure grounds.
44. One-off opportunity that needs to be grasped positively. Do something amazing to bring people in.
45. I agree with Jo Letchford's letter on this - leave Princes Parade alone, protect the natural habitat.
46. What about infrastructure - water, shops, schools.
47. Highly likely to leave asbestos.
48. It would be criminal to build anything on this site - we need green space. This is very special combination of sea, green, canal, walking space, etc.
49. Local opposition NIMBY's.
50. If the waste area is dug up there will be concerns about blown dust and pollution.
51. Need for its preservation as green recreation site open to all.
52. Council should speak to residents and to visitors - then leave it alone!
53. NIMBY's!! No you are mistaken. As a child we came to Hythe to appreciate open, underdeveloped space. As an adult 24yrs in Maidstone the same. Lots of people come to Hythe for the open, refreshing space.
54. Surely extensive development would need a bus service along Princes Parade. Not enough of access from Seabrook Road even with the bridges.
55. Apply for village grown status to protect it.
56. Absolutely the ruination of our beautiful town.
57. This tells you all you need to know about Shepway.
58. Should be an open public space.

## What are the key opportunities for the wider area?

1. New homes not on seafront, houses are not selling.
2. Currently overgrown so we can't use it...Why not cut it back a bit to provide a coastal park with paths and benches? Something ought to be done with this land! Just no buildings please!
3. The beach and promenade do not need enhancing it is great as it is.
4. No social housing or ANY housing! Recreation only please.
5. Building here would mean unbroken concrete from the Warren Hotel reaching Littlestone. The area is well used and enjoyed for its wildlife and good air as it is - the healthy option.
6. Keep it as an open space. Don't build on this flood plain.
7. Develop think of future generations and not of yourselves.
8. No social housing. Prime location! Keep it green!
9. Attractive area for visitors and locals.
10. Instead of employing consultants at great costs ask the local people what they want.
11. Don't want to see development on contaminated lines
12. Develop in the manner of Lower Leas Park without buildings.
13. Ditto.
14. A chance to retain the historical and ecological legacy of this area.
15. Earth sheltered buildings would be great.
16. Retain the elements of primarily a wildlife 'parkland' bordering a canal. Another development would bring visitors to area increasing capital income to garage/restaurants.
17. Luxury homes would be such a waste of an opportunity.
18. Vital lung between two built up urban areas through which a historical canal runs.
19. Should have accepted the marina to bring people into Hythe and also make a beautiful site.
20. Key opportunity is not to ruin or spoil any further!
21. Visitors. Something for kids. Economics.
22. If land is built on - What opportunities? Cannot see much opportunities on housing once developed!!!
23. A lovely park for all to enjoy - no need for homes.
24. Inclusion of community within development to avoid alienation. The option to not develop is likely to be more destructive in long term.
25. Moderate and affordable housing to attract younger working homeowners.
26. No opportunities for the wider area. Please leave us some green areas. To develop this area is a disgrace.
27. Ask the natural wildlife! It's their home.
28. No more urban sprawl.
29. Leave it alone! That's why we moved to Hythe for its natural beauty, lovely dog walks etc.
30. To add a proper community centre for Hythe.
31. Enhance the asset that is the seafront. Currently neglected.
32. Do not develop, leave well and truly alone.
33. The school on this site could be community based and provide wider facilities.
34. Keep them away building along Princes Parade. We need to keep our green areas for future generation.
35. Folkestone and Dymchurch have 'kiss me quick' hats and arcades not required in Hythe.
36. We may need housing for younger people - fine - go to Hawkinge!! (only the most important historical site now ruined!!)
37. Open space attracts visitors leave it alone.
38. The area in front of the current swimming pool is very poor and needs to be improved - knock down the concrete beach huts.

39. Nature does NOT need tidying up it's very precious as it is!
40. Tourism.
41. Why can't area be left underdeveloped as wild life area Shepway should maintain area.
42. Could the canal be widened for use? The marina idea was lovely.
43. Development low scale. Leisure – pool and garden open spaces.
44. Natural park. Nature reserve. A place happily devoid of commercial opportunities and charges where locals and visitors can spend free time.
45. What about natural resources, water etc, facilities, shops, hospitals, etc, leave Hythe alone, a unique and historical place, leave it alone.

### **How is the area used at the moment?**

1. At the two ends of the seafront road, from the petrol station to Twiss Road, turn it into a 'shared area' maximum 20mph, with speed reduction, narrow gates at either end, and at several points in between, thus bringing Princes Parade land and the reach into one public area.
2. You only have to look at the golf course to realise that Princes Parade needs to be turned into a similar well maintained open green space, but for public use. Cf. The coastal path below the Leas. No building or swimming pool.
3. Area appears to go right up to the canal - the path and surrounding areas are very well used now. Leisure needs are vital.
4. No - keep it green.
5. Do you want to make our sea front look like Dover? Ugh!
6. I use this space every day or twice a day - as does my wife.
7. SDC are blocking other 'Brown Field' development because they want to sell this land for development!
8. School for Seabrook use another site there are plenty.
9. Used frequently for walking - otherwise it's a nature reserve.
10. Every day the paths by the canal are extensively used - by all ages - keeping the older people healthy!!
11. Dog walking on periphery not used enough by public owing to council keep out signs only wildlife on site.
12. Not much council car park hardly used.
13. For all range of peoples, walk and younger persons to see nature as it is intended various bird, insects etc live there we watched peacocks then chicks.
14. Planning permission will happen on golf course and this will create a strip of urbanisation along this whole coastline.
15. A lot of comments tell of how the site is currently used for recreation. Whilst the canal is used widely the site is mainly inaccessible and unused. However it represents a significant ecological habitat which should be enhanced.
16. Used constantly by local wildlife, nesting birds, rare insects, protected plants and by people!
17. Site of primary school already designated - why not use it?
18. I look at it and love it! When its gone its gone forever.
19. The area is well used for a variety of recreation and should be preserved as such.
20. Not the best location for the swimming pool. Hythe Green is much better!
21. Extensively used (illegally) by dog walkers, joggers, kite flying, fishermen, kayakers.
22. Natural habitat, walking, strolling, contemplation, kayak, canoeing, fishing, cycle route. Pleasing backdrop to the beach.
23. A green lung - a haven for wildlife - protection from high seas. A potential leisure area.
24. What happens in the winter to draw people in?
25. This is a historic site and one of natural beauty. Absolutely not suitable for housing. Should be kept as a green and non-light polluted area.
26. It cannot be used at the moment as the council use it as a dumping area when they dredged the canal. You used to use it as a picnic area!
27. I don't even need to walk on it to enjoy it just as I don't need to swim in the sea to enjoy it!
28. The canal path is really well used at lots of times of day.
29. Why all the secrecy at first.
30. For nature and unspoilt beauty - should stay that way.
31. Council 'no access' signs removed and open to public again.
32. For freedom from buildings.

33. The parade is constantly used for walking by the locals. It is a beautiful area - totally UNSPOILT!!
34. Unused and unattractive - waste of an asset.
35. A green area that is a rare commodity these days.
36. Children's play park. Car park and a green unspoilt area.
37. The council cannot keep building on Hythe's green spaces. Please think of the health of the local community.
38. Too many packed house at present to add another estate puts pressure on all infrastructure.
39. People come for the ambience, history and green space not areas of development.
40. The Imperial will develop the golf course, now that it is planning for housing the grounds. Then the whole stretch would be developed.
41. It has been closed by Shepway.
42. An attractive open space, leisure.
43. Relaxation leave it.
44. Walking, bird-watching, cycling, fishing, relaxing, enjoying nature.
45. At the current time the site is not used to any extent by the public (locals or visitors).
46. It's currently beautiful land, which we are not allowed to go on. It should be open to the public.
47. We can't use it because Shepway won't give us access. We need it as open space.
48. Ecological area rich in wildlife. Limited public access (this could be mitigated with limited expense).
49. As a view that sets off the town - it is the lungs of the town.
50. I walk every day with my dog meeting lots of others - exercise does promote health - please leave this area the same - i.e. informal and available to all.
51. Waste land - not used only the footpath.
52. 'Waste' land is necessary for wildlife, and for refreshing the environment and the soul!!
53. Public open space leisure i.e. pool, school, picnic area.
54. Wasteland unused, thank God.

## What roles could Princes Parade play in the future?

1. Could have swimming pool at eastern end but shouldn't have housing – feel strongly.
2. Whilst Shepway Council treat this area as a monetary asset. This is not something that they can decide to sell to release funds when the majority of the residents do not want or need this.
3. Shame on greedy Shepway.
4. Please no houses.
5. A more open park would be lovely.
6. It is bribery and corrupt to tempt locals with the promises of schools and swimming pools (land already designated) on Princes Parade.
7. Proper local amenity rather than wasteland. Pool. Proper park. Housing if necessary to fund.
8. Visitors come here BECAUSE we're different i.e. not developed!!
9. Something does not need to be done at the site but it should be leisure uses and open space.
10. Hands off our open space!!
11. Should have some employment uses not just homes so Hythe won't just be dormitory or retirement town.
12. You have already built on Oaklands! You are building on a well-used waste and sports area (Seapoint) why do we lose so much?!
13. Sustainable development (Visitors, educational centre). Public footpaths, small scale developments.
14. Why can't we put a swimming pool where it already is? (Better for Hythe.)
15. A natural nature reserve of health benefit to all.
16. Avoid disturbing as it is an old dump and it will contain toxic material.
17. Open amenity for use of public, part wild life part recreation no building to destroy site lines.
18. Leave it alone!
19. Attractive visitors to Hythe.
20. Need an eco visitor centre with cafe.
21. There is no option for a watersports centre – the canoe centre is ready to proceed.
22. Should have a fabulous pool with beautiful outdoor space and cafe area. Glass building to see the sea – glass building dedicate area to community use and sport.
23. We need open parkland, for our children to play.
24. Continuing amenity for recreation essential for the area.
25. A linear park and leisure area with the potential for children's facilities, "seaside" stalls etc.
26. We wouldn't like to see flats on the space. Need more imagination. We don't want candy floss and kiss me quick.
27. School located very well on Princes Parade.
28. Do not build another Lower Leas Park.
29. Want affordable housing for local people if there is any housing.
30. This visitors could be used for visitors and locals alike to enjoy. It could be an extension of the beach. A park for all to use would be good.
31. Leave alone.
32. Need more beachside activities – bars / cafes.
33. I would like the space left as an open space and nature reserve.
34. Does need to have something done – not currently fulfilling potential – just no houses.
35. A place for inhabitants (flora, fauna and 'folk') to continue to coexist.
36. Princes Parade should be similar to Romney Warren.
37. No more housing please, there's more than enough going on already.
38. We could have a park like the Lees in Folkstone.
39. Divide area into small plots to safeguard for future generations – we treasure it!
40. Need space for young people with some facilities for play.

41. We really need a park - we have open space but it can't be used by locals.
42. Would like to see new Seabrook School on Princes Parade rather than Eversley Road area.
43. I need convincing the developers have any other motive than greed!! Leave nature be - there's little enough of it!!
44. Linear park to be used as a tourist attraction.
45. No houses enough is enough.
46. A natural break between the town and the sea.
47. A peaceful area for flora and fauna and locals and visitors close to the beach and canal. Don't ruin it!
48. Every time I drive past I am grateful for this space.
49. Leave the seafront open and build denser area of flats to leave open space.
50. An excellent place for the new Seabrook Primary School with playing field.
51. Car parking and cafe / community facility eg youth centre but don't trust that this won't end up with housing.
52. People want open space to use and happy to see school there.
53. If school is built retain land for nature classes, play areas for all local children.
54. Sustainable exemplar development must be adopted, architectural legacy to inspire the wider community. Put Hythe on the map.
55. Could be like the area in Sandgate that has been landscaped.
56. Why do we have to ruin nature, haven't learnt anything buildings and greed.
57. Leave alone no building.
58. Do not be fooled by Councillors regarding school it has already been earmarked elsewhere.
59. Restaurant on the pool.
60. If something, it should be a pool.
61. Please sub-divide the land to sell to interested residents to manage and value and love.
62. We want to get revenue back to get year on year funding.
63. No to housing yes to leisure - path / nature reserve.
64. A natural wildlife area don't lose what we have for all to enjoy.
65. Better to build the school on Princes Parade and put houses on the school field - more open space on the seafront.
66. Some or all of suggestions plus cafes and other seafront attractions.
67. Attract tourists for local economy.
68. If it has to be developed, it should be community uses including open space. Not housing.
69. A complete waste of tax payers' money - NO development!
70. Wouldn't like to just have housing on it.
71. Public open space full stop.
72. Remember south of England sinking - don't need more concrete.
73. Possible use by Seabrook School. The Hythe Bay opportunity makes very good use of Fisherman's Beach could Seabrook do similar with Princes Parade?
74. I don't want to see housing built here can it be left clear.
75. Open space.
76. The site should provide a public amenity which will also be attractive to visitors and encourage them to visit Hythe.
77. Need open spaces so water can drag through to water table.
78. Site should be parkland for the local residents.
79. Develop the water sports in the area to bring in money and more tourism.
80. No housing.
81. Open space for walking, don't want anything to spoil coastline.

82. Leave Princes Parade as is. Councillors who are unable to manage resources without selling of land should be ashamed of themselves. Development on Princes Parade for financial gain is a legacy of which their children and grandchildren would be horrified at the destruction of the environment.
83. Leisure only and swimming pool and school facilities only.
84. Leave along. Natural place with walks. Visitor's attraction.
85. There's a big need for new homes - our kids need to live somewhere.

### **What does the local area really need which this site could provide?**

1. I love swimming but not at expense of beloved natural beauty.
2. Our only easily accessible wild walking space: some children cannot walk on rough ground due to lack of exercise or opportunity, keep it wild.
3. If we keep the space we can use it for events.
4. We don't need a new school!! Palmarsh is in danger of shutting so few kids.
5. New pool please, no housing.
6. The school site is already twice what it was.
7. Please! Do not spoil this area of Princes Parade.
8. Limited development for community. Green features. No housing.
9. Princes Parade has evolved into a beautiful habitat for wildlife and locals to enjoy - it would be another council crime to develop. Profit before people.
10. You got the money from selling Seapoint centre! Where is it!?
11. Why not redevelop the existing pool site? Seabrook pool is too far from Hythe to serve local area needs unexplained open space.
12. Local area for recreation and leisure.
13. Why do we need more housing and a new pool.
14. Don't want a kiss-me-quick feel - learn from Southwold.
15. Recreation and leisure.
16. It's perfect as it is why change things.
17. Need a common sense mixture of development.
18. I'd like to see a swimming pool on the seafront here.
19. Pleasant public park - great! New swimming pool - great! Houses - definitely NO!!
20. An open area to walk or play in a green environment.
21. Improve setting of canal - yes; create a new public park - yes; swimming pool - no - replace existing pool what happened to Nicols Quarry money. Primary school - no - they have own site pinpointed.
22. Please please please leave alone!
23. Open space a "village green" designation along the Parade.
24. A park for the children.
25. The site already supplies a much needed green lung - ie undeveloped
26. Do not rush the night sky with short sighted sweeteners leave open and wild.
27. Use the Seapoint money to build a pool.
28. Keep access to open green site.
29. Coastal park as in Lower Sandgate Road public conveniences.
30. Deliver new homes - no - not here, plenty of other places more suitable.
31. Best to let it turn into a wood - willow already established, as an old tip site (60's) and recently the canal mud deposited would help habitat to flourish
32. We already have designated sites for Seabrook School, school inland in the centre of Seabrook - the swimming pool can be rebuilt on empty site.
33. Leave the area alone, put public toilets there for walkers.
34. No development please. We need this space. It is special.
35. Park for leisure facilities would be great. If the Twiss Road new houses are not sold yet - why build more housing?
36. Can we bring back the marina project.
37. Leisure and recreation area - good. New swimming pool - yes. Small marina with cafes and shops - yes. Houses - no!
38. Council tax payers in Hythe want it to stay as it is - leave alone.

39. Leave the site it is the wrong place to have this type of development.
40. Amenities that harmonise with the existing parade and do not fundamentally change the feel and look of the area.
41. A massive swimming pool.
42. New pool at Portex or Nichols Quarry!!
43. Preserve as a green open space area – subject to tidying up.
44. A decent play area similar to the Leas. The existing playground is only suitable for very small children and past its sell by date.
45. A lovely restaurant / cafe overlooking the sea.
46. Open space for residents essential.
47. Leave the site as is. If the local council need an income propose a leisure facility with minimal impact on the existing site.
48. A leisure area.
49. If development is done well it could be great for the area.
50. Public toilets nothing else definitely no houses.
51. Recreational land.
52. Keep it recreational, swimming pool okay, no houses.
53. So much sport here but not enough for arts – need a good hall for events / audience.
54. Open space, water sports, car parking, play area shared with school, swimming pool?
55. Open space with public access and paths for walking / cycling.
56. Majority of Hythe rate payers would prefer it stay as it is.
57. Economic housing, seafront attractions.
58. Only undeveloped area for miles.
59. Leave it as it is please.
60. It's an eye sore now, swimming pool, open space, pleasure gardens, cafe/pub.
61. For the future – children can experience nature. Don't keep building.
62. Nothing on seafront between Hythe Bay restaurant and pub in Sandgate – nowhere to sit and enjoy open view.
63. It needs to love what it's got. Less is more.
64. Recreational leisure.
65. Is currently a wasted space – needs cafe and other uses to attract visitors, with some homes. Can fit parking. If in south of France would be landscaped and have uses.
66. New swimming yes please one not used is horrible and old but please be built on old site no Princes Parade.
67. Swimming pool – not used at the moment.
68. To be open to the public.
69. A space to breathe as Hythe is becoming busier with traffic and cluttered with buildings.
70. Leave it alone or a marina.
71. SDC need to meet budgets. The Princes Parade area needs to be left and not destroyed by housing etc.
72. Open space.
73. Development has to come – it's a great idea – we need new blood round here.
74. Beach huts, restaurant, learn from supermarket.
75. Swimming pool open area for leisure activities and walking – yes. Housing NEVER. Losing too much green open space to development.
76. New swimming pool.
77. Seabrook needs open space.
78. Kent coast has seen lots of improvement, Dela Warr, Worthing restaurant. We need to think like this.

79. This is motivated by high house prices in the area - profit opportunity only.

## What are the key issues for the wider area?

1. Setting of canal is unspoilt and beautiful as it is.
2. What will happen to the existing Seabrook School site?
3. Should have a market stall on seafront by Princes Parade for consultation.
4. Leave it as a wildlife area – visitors won't come to see more houses.
5. Please take a look at the area in front of the swimming pool – dirty area surrounding it.
6. Planning authority and council can't be trusted.
7. Build block of flats, 8 storeys high, inland. Do not build on land for food production and relaxation.
8. Why did Shepway not keep Tradewinds? All we're left with is that hideous caff in front of the swimming pool!
9. Is there a question of suitability of the land fill for development?
10. Focus on Folkestone harbour area development, not this part of Hythe.
11. An area that can be used.
12. Too much infilling of open space with housing, leading to more traffic and congestion.
13. The existing site of the swimming pool is disgusting with a terrible cafe on the prom. If the pool were relocated that whole area needs sympathetic redevelopment.
14. Realise with recession there are funding issues, but to plunder a green space like this is heresy.
15. It's necessary to leave a large open space between Hythe and Sandgate to differentiate between the towns.
16. All natural areas. Should remain – this is a tourist area not a building site.
17. Concerns about the golf course – worries that it's being wound down to create a potential development site.
18. Unnecessary development driven by desire of developers to use green space and try to make money at any cost!
19. Would like to see primary school either at existing site / Princes Parade or as planned with field on Eversley Way field wouldn't like to see homes on field.
20. No to development unnecessary, why spoil the area?
21. Low cost development can be innovative – doesn't have to be poor quality.
22. Space for space sake! When its gone its gone forever.
23. Minimising the intrusive impact of development at odds with the unique nature of this area.
24. Road structure is not going to cope unless its improved.
25. No! No! No! development.
26. Consultation – only 11am to 4pm what about all those at work who cannot attend??
27. To use asset for benefit of all – nature, homeowners, visitors, area development.
28. Leave this area as it is. Too much building going on.
29. Better use of 'infill' rather than lose green, potential leisure area.
30. The area in general is having the green spaces reduced. These spaces are what makes Hythe special and therefore need to be retained for current and future generations.
31. More traffic already – can't cope with cluttered roads. Need to keep free parking. Leave as open space.
32. The development will destroy what brings people to the area the canal walks.
33. Lack of public access, is this area needed to expand the Hythe area. Can development be carried out further inland.
34. Beware road and traffic issues.
35. Services amalgamation of coastal recreation facilities - swimming pool. What is the do nothing option?
36. Very worried about what's going on at the Imperial.
37. Add doctors surgery – not enough in Hythe.

38. Council should realise its asset to improve local area.
39. Publicity for this consultation has been deplorable – a ploy??
40. I also don't believe that a second school, swimming school, will be built – housing will be built first then no money for swimming pool or school!
41. Flats above redeveloped swimming pool a really good idea – already flats there in that area!
42. For schools and experts to study. To learn as this lot of councillors have not.
43. What about all the rubbish dumped under there? A lot of illegal waste from unknown sources!!
44. Replace revolting beach 'huts' with attractive ones that could produce revenue.
45. Attracting visitors to the area.
46. The space is an excellent back drop for the town – it makes no difference. No more clutter!
47. I don't believe for a second that a school or swimming pool will be built on contaminated land.  
Therefore, we will just be left with the housing at the end of the process.
48. Do something which generates higher values.
49. The development appears too big for the site. Road traffic issues. Ecology issues.
50. Will completely spoil integrity of area – “Where country meets the sea?” – will that still be true!!  
(Have seen kestrels / pheasants etc)
51. Risk of losing a great asset that residents and visitors currently enjoy.
52. We need green open space available to all.
53. There is enough housing development on front already. The view of Hythe from seafront is unique and should not be blocked by housing.

### **What aspects of the site would you most like to protect?**

1. No way - leave alone.
2. No housing leisure use! Prize spot people come from miles around!
3. Lovely area needs to be upgraded for leisure use / canal improvement etc no housing.
4. A unique wildlife habitat which can be used by everyone and enjoyed! To build on the Parade would mean the loss of a huge local area.
5. All of it! It is unique!
6. Save the area for local people to use for recreation.
7. Keep Princes Parade as is. School, swimming pool and new homes should be sites elsewhere.
8. The area near canal.
9. Leave Princes Parade as it is for the enjoyment of future generations. Selling everything off for short term monetary gain is disgraceful.
10. Lack of litter bins on housing estates, no drop curbs, all round tree maintenance.
11. The openness and rough / wild nature - no more housing for weekenders from London.
12. Wildlife area, no light pollution uncluttered sight lines from Imperial to Battery Point.
13. Multitude of wildlife - kingfishers, badgers, foxes.
14. None.
15. As it is.
16. Would like to see certain areas left for wildlife.
17. All of it leave it alone.
18. It is a unique green area and once it is gone we can't get it back.
19. Leave whole alone.
20. Keep it as it is but maintain it ???
21. Keep as an open site.
22. Flora and fauna.
23. All aspects! The actual site would be a good idea.
24. Wildness; no development; habitat; open views; absence of commercialism and charges for use.
25. It's wildness and natural foliage and wildlife - the feeling its nature at its best unspoilt and beautiful.
26. Keep off our land there are too many houses there.
27. Maintain as much as possible the view to the hills from the seaside walk. The height of buildings has to be taken into consideration otherwise these will be objections.
28. All of it
29. The greenery and the view.
30. Learn from the Canadians. Do not build on Princes Parade. The Canadians have a similar situation in B.C. No building on it ever!
31. The council sees the site as an important asset purely so as they can make a fortune from developing it! Just think of the Fisherman's Beach.
32. A lot of people visit Hythe sea front because it is undeveloped, an open space.
33. Under no circumstances should residential properties be built on this site.
34. The natural state. Space. Lack of buildings. Wildlife.
35. It's fine as it is leave it alone.
36. All of it. No houses.
37. Leave as is.
38. If any form of housing permitted, it must not be near the flood plan. What would we get if block of flats? This would be hideous.
39. One of the most significant military defences - ranks with Hadrian's Wall and Offa's Dyke.
40. All of the area should be left alone not for profit.
41. Leave alone!!! No building.

42. The canal and the view i.e. keep low rise.
43. The pool is in the right location - renovate and build flats over.
44. Leave this area alone! Here Here !
45. The swimming pool should be left where it is.
46. The pool should be re-built on the current site incorporating flats / outside space / restaurant. A bit of vision on the part of SBC would be a start!
47. All of it.
48. The canal edge is significant in its enhancement of the canal. The larger section of site is most suitable for larger dev. The higher elevation of the site would limit height of dev.
49. Leave it as an open area for wildlife but include access for walkers.
50. The uninterrupted view of the sea with no buildings or horrible concrete penthouse flats blocking the views.
51. The green space.
52. Openness, free access, nature habitat.
53. You've got Hawkingge for housing for young people! We all had to start somewhere!
54. I grew up in Tenterden and came to Hythe for a swim. I lived in Maidstone for 24 years and came to Hythe for a rest peace and quiet because it is undeveloped.
55. It's a rubbish tip because SBC can't be bothered to keep it clean!
56. It's a rubbish tip at the moment - any thing is an improvement.
57. Does nature = rubbish for some? Re wildlife appreciate it!!
58. All of it! Especially the canal and seafront.
59. Don't destroy the night sky. It's one of the last places to see the stars clearly.
60. I agree - all of it.
61. All of it.
62. Protect the golf course.
63. At night, the sky is mainly or completely unpolluted. You can see the stars. To be protected.
64. All of it.

### **What aspects of the site would you most like to change?**

1. We do need a replacement pool in Princes Parade. Put it in South Road where old one is.
2. Nothing.
3. Improve and develop the swimming pool. Lighting along the seafront so people can walk safely.
4. Remove the garage and diner - who agreed to put those there?
5. Why change it natural area full of wildlife.
6. All weather sports pitch with lights. Redevelop swimming pool with flats above. Decent cafe on the prom. Yes to Princes Parade development.
7. Needs proper maintenance.
8. Get rid of Japanese knot wood cut back some of shrubbery leave most open.
9. Clearing the site for local pleasure.
10. Please do not do anything to this lovely place thank you.
11. Not necessary to build here - develop elsewhere, leave green and undeveloped for views, animals and birds, pleasure of residents and visitors. Part of inherent charm and nature of area. Don't ruin it!
12. Re whole site would be nice to keep green but at the same time something for families to enjoy such as a park - picnic tables, BBQ's, trees!!
13. Nothing.
14. A new pool and school but this is not the correct site.
15. IT is the rarest of things - it is a space next to the sea - we are so lucky. Please don't lose it!
16. Not just houses + restaurants + swimming pool + green areas.
17. To make the most of the water sports that are available.
18. Possible minimal sympathetic development at either end with change of levels in centre are retaining essence of green space.
19. Access to all.
20. We don't need silly pastels explaining what nature is!! Leave well alone.
21. Whilst minimum development of a swimming pool (and parking for it?) or a school may be not too appalling extensive housing would be an eyesore, unnecessary and appalling!
22. Leave the area alone!!
23. A green area properly developed with possible swimming pool site - but NO housing.
24. None
25. The considerate ?? development. Green space designation to be legislated.
26. No change!!
27. Hands off leave it alone
28. Leave it all as a wildlife site.
29. Accessibility to the site is poor. Provision of recreation space.
30. Do not change an environment which is as nature intended.
31. Pool - yes; primary school - yes; houses - no; industry - no.
32. Leave it alone!
33. Do not touch astronomical.
34. It's visitor attracting aspects - waste of a resource.
35. Nothing leave it alone!
36. No to more houses.
37. Allow the public to use the land.
38. Any pool should not be here. It should remain on its existing sufficient, convenient site. Not on Princes Parade.
39. Traffic problems - more housing just going add to the log jam.
40. Pool - low rise; School - low rise; Beach huts at the most.
41. Nothing.

42. Allow public access to a natural site.
43. Light pollution from housing.
44. Things are always left in a state of dereliction and the only answer is an easier one dig it up and build!! What a terrible thing.
45. A few footpaths so we can walk on it. Then please leave it alone.
46. Speed of traffic along the road. 30mph.
47. Make it a green park - No houses or industry.
48. No houses green park only.
49. In the wider sense nothing. It needs cleaning up to be made accessible and useable. It is a 'scruffy' site which can be improved.
50. Open space public access.