

LAND BETWEEN QUARRY LANE & PAEZENS LANE	
COMMENT	RESPONSE
OPPOSE	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The start of ribbon development and invites future plans to join up with Quarry Cottages. Not a good idea. 	Consultation has always favoured a compact village without linear extensions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will spread the village too much. 	As above
SUPPORT	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The most reasonable place to develop. Giving residents privacy, footpaths and parking and not having a detrimental effect on existing properties. However the fact still remains the land falls within important landscape policy areas which are there to protect the area and character of Beer. 	Creates linear extension into the countryside and potential coalescence with quarry cottages and branscombe
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continuation of the recent development of Townsend and if built in the same style would be in-keeping with the first phase dwellings. All the necessary services are within reach and easily accessible. It is one of the largest plots and is accessible by road already. The site would be the most cost effective for the village of all the sites, due to accessibility/lay of the land. Disruption would be less due to location. 	As above also issues with access and efficient use of land
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A path could be made so that the children could walk to school. 	Agreed but other option gives shorter travel lines to village and school
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Near the CLT development, safe for children to walk to school and quieter environment. 	As above
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly support this site although it will slightly extend the shape of the village. Site flatter than some of the other sites proposed. An easy, safe, pedestrian route to school could be created (abrev). 	As above, no actual scheme put forward and therefore no indication of numbers or access

EXTENSION OF SHORT FURLONG DEVELOPMENT TO THE WEST	
COMMENT	RESPONSE
OPPOSE	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This site has been picked so children in the new homes will be near to the school. However, children in the village are being turned away as the school is full. 	Not a planning issue numbers would be accepted as existing pupils leave
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The entrance and exit to this site is small. Also the Short Furlong car park is full, leaving very little room for cars in and out of the site on to quite a dangerous road. 	Access will be a planning and highways issue - if not acceptable then the site will not be delivered
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Over development of existing site. 	The site is in addition to the existing development and therefore will not impact on the density of the existing site
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dangerous for children crossing road – accident will happen. Too much traffic on Mare Lane. 	See above re highways
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns about vehicle access to the site via Mare Lane. (We would have no issue with pedestrian access via Mare Lane). High volume of traffic uses Mare Lane already for school and Peco, including buses, lorries and larger vehicles. While the build was underway, the situation would be exacerbated by construction traffic. The new development would cause significant extra traffic and not facilitate safer access to public areas and facilities (Policy CFS2) 	See above re highways
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A shame to lose more green fields above the village. 	Agreed but the development is kept low and will not impinge on the skyline
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would impact on skyline green belt. 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If drainage from this site will be directed to the sump at Paezens Lane, why not build on site 1. 	The developers will be required to provide acceptable drainage - this has no impact on site selection

EXTENSION OF SHORT FURLONG DEVELOPMENT TO THE WEST	
COMMENT	RESPONSE
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has already been refused by EDDC on policy grounds. 	<p>Agreed current policy rejects sites over 15 houses outside of BUAB. The PC and consultation has identified this as the preferred site and this is the reason for including its allocation in the NP to promote the community preference over LP policy</p>
SUPPORT	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site close to all amenities i.e. school, village etc and has room for houses to have decent sized rooms and more importantly gardens, parking space, garage. 	<p>These are the primary reasons for supporting the site along with the potential to deliver 13 affordable homes.</p> <p>Development would also be at the entrance of the village reducing construction traffic and future residential traffic from the village.</p>

FIELD TO THE SOUTH OF PARK ROAD TO THE WEST OF SOUTHDOWN	
COMMENT	RESPONSE
OPPOSE	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When we had the “flood” in Beer, the water came down from above Park Road but there was no problem with excess water coming off the hillside fields up Park Road. Surely building houses, laying drives, walkways etc would lead to excess water running down Park Road and then Clapps Lane. In the recent Monsoon, the water coming down Clapps Lane has been quite deep and covering most of the road surface – any greater volume of water would cause serious problems. 	The steepness of the site would lead to inefficient use of land and significant intrusion during the construction process. The additional roads, drives and domestic sewerage would put possibly unacceptable burden on the sewerage network
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I would oppose plans to build on site 3 on the grounds that building on these steep fields would cause a lot of water run-off which could cause problems further down the road. The fields soak a lot of the water up in all these bad winters we get. Also the drains in Park Road couldn’t cope with more housing. Another point is the traffic disruption – Park Road is the main route out of Beer according to all the road signs in the village. 	As above
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed site in Park Road should definitely not be considered for development. There have already been 3 attempts to build here – in 1965, 1992 and 1993 and all those applications were refused, the reasons given among others being the unsuitability of the steep site, increase in traffic both vehicular and pedestrian, being in a Conservation Area and AONB, the visual impact so detrimental to those already living in Park Road and the precedent it would set for further development all along that road. 	As above
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impacts on skyline viewed from village. 	Agreed
Shame to lose a green field above the village	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern about additional traffic in narrow roads and disruption of construction traffic. 	As above
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is too small and beyond the building line and also a steep hill. 	As above

FIELD TO THE SOUTH OF PARK ROAD TO THE WEST OF SOUTHDOWN

- Construction vehicles would also cause chaos and disruption through the village. Very little parking there now

As above

- This site has already been refused planning permission three times in the past on the following grounds:
 - AONB and Coastal Preservation Area
 - Serious visual intrusion
 - Precedent for development along a road which due to its width and alignment is unsuitable to accommodate the additional traffic generated
 - Increase in pedestrian traffic on a highway lacking adequate footways with consequent additional danger to all users of the road

As above

Park Road fields are still set in the AONB, Coastal Preservation Area and outside the Built up Area and are viewed from Barline and Underleys and from other areas of the village such as Clinton Rise and Long Hill. It would be a very steep and expensive site to develop. The impact on the existing residents in Park Road, with the majority of properties now in private ownership, would be quite considerable with a loss in property value and a serious loss of privacy and an increase in street parking. Park Road has no pavements and more often than not is a single carriageway with on street parking. With more housing this problem would only get worse. In the Summer months particularly it is extremely busy with holiday traffic, HGV lorries and the moving of caravans to and from Beer Head Caravan Park, all of which are routed away from the village and around Park Road and Underleys. Many treat Park Road like a race track and have no regard for the people living there or the pedestrians walking up and down the road, often with young children. Regularly overshooting the hairpin bend at the top of Park Road as they are going too fast! The same AONB and Coastal Preservation Area policies remain on this land, which are there to protect and preserve the character of the area. The volume and speed of the traffic has got worse not better and therefore this land should not even be considered for development.

LAND OFF NEW ROAD	
COMMENT	RESPONSE
OPPOSE	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Three of the housing sites have merit – Land off New Road is wholly unsuitable for stability (a fault line), drainage and the issues with traffic access safely to the main road. 	NP policy is to resist coalescence with Seaton – this site fails this irrespective of practical constraints
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site 4 would be unsuitable to build on as the ground is unstable – there are cracks in part of the field. 	See above
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The green wedge between Beer and Seaton should be maintained therefore this field should not be considered for development. I have been told the field has sunk quite considerably over the last 60 years? which may prove a problem for any development. 	See above
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no pedestrian pathway along some of the route (busy road) for access into the village. 	See above and acknowledge access issues
Cont below....	

LAND OFF NEW ROAD

- This site is inappropriate for the following reasons and should be omitted from consideration:
 - a) This site is outside the Beer Village Built-up Area Boundary
 - b) This site is within the Coastal Preservation Area. Building in the Coastal Preservation area would adversely affect the view from the sea.
 - c) This site was considered in the 2012 SHLAA Report and was deleted and withdrawn.
 - d) The site is adjacent to a Special Area of Conservation and would adversely affect the adjacent coastal area.
 - e) This site is in an Area of Great Landscape Value. According to Policy CO4 of the Devon County Council Structure Plan 2011-2016: “New development should therefore only be provided for where it would be limited in its visual impact.” Housing on this site would have significant visual impact.
 - f) This site does not abut nor is physically closely related to the Build-up Area. This conflicts with Strategy 35 of the Local Plan.
 - g) This site is geologically unstable. The ravine in the centre of this area has sunk considerably in recent decades and can be expected to continue to do so. Building on this site would result in unsafe housing, subsidence, and potentially undermine the stability of adjacent properties opening the council to potential liability.
 - h) Building on this site would be against Policy NE1 – Development and Natural Environment. This site is important to protected species such as badgers and bats. There are several badger setts on this site and it provides a feeding area for local bats.
 - i) This site is within the Seaton Gap. Building houses on this site contradicts Policy HBE1 of the draft Neighbourhood Plan.
 - j) Building on this site would adversely affect the view upon entering Beer from Seaton.
 - k) An access road from New Road to this site would be unsafe. This stretch of New Road is already dangerous. There was a major head-on collision in this area earlier in 2016. This site was reviewed in 2012 with the following comment. “The highway authority is not convinced it would be possible to provide a suitable access to this site.”
 - l) Building on this site would affect the natural drainage of the site and could undermine the cliff and precipitate coastal erosion.
 - m) This site is located in an area of archaeological potential. Evidence for Prehistoric and Roman activity has been found in the Beer-Seaton area. Building on this site would adversely affect the heritage value of the site.

See above and acknowledge additional points supporting objection

LAND OFF NEW ROAD

- My observations are as follows (abrev): i) This site is directly on the Jurassic Coast, an area for local walkers and nature lovers and very importantly tourists. The coastal path runs along the site and I believe building here would be extremely damaging to this area of outstanding natural beauty. Ref (enc) EDDC Search 8 May 2015 denoting site as Area of Great Landscape Value and Coastal Preservation Area within Local Plan 2001-2011. (Policy NE1)
- ii) If development is agreed here this would have a massive impact on the natural environment as it is currently a field where horses graze together with an abundance of wild bunny rabbits and other wildlife. The site is bordered by indigenous hedges and trees. (Policy NE3)
- iii) Building on this site will impact the pavement that has been built to allow people to walk into Beer village safely on New Road which is quite bendy. Indeed the road has seen a recent accident as there is a blind spot directly by Garlands. Building a housing development on this site will only increase the local traffic and risk damage to the footpath that people enjoy whilst viewing the Jurassic Coast. (Policy NE5)
- iv) Given the recent landslip just a bit further along the coast at Seaton we would be extremely worried about the stability of the land at this site, given this area is directly on the land adjacent to the coast edge. It is also on a slope that we wouldn't think practical for development. (Policy MS2)
- v) Building on this site would compromise the visual openness and landscape of Beer Local Gap. This site is the beginning of the gap and there is only this field and the adjacent field before the Seaton boundary. (Ref Beer PC Community Survey Report Dec 2014 – 76.5% of people thought it was important to retain the green wedge between Seaton & Beer) (Policy HBE1)
- vi) Building on this site would damage our existing holiday accommodation/small business (density of people/traffic/cars/disruption during construction) which will damage the amount of tourists we bring to Beer, local people we employ and also have implications for our booking agent based in Beer. (Policy T5)
- vii) Our property is a house of historic importance to Beer and its setting in an AONB should be preserved for future generations to enjoy.

See above and acknowledge points supporting objection

LAND OFF NEW ROAD

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents in Beer Road, Seaton, have contacted me about the inclusion of this site in your consultation as a possible site for affordable homes. I brought their concerns to Seaton Town Council Planning Committee, which discussed the matter at its meeting yesterday. The Planning Committee asked me to write to you to express Seaton Town Council's concern about the inclusion of this site. We fully understand the importance of designating sites for affordable housing. Indeed we have recently complained once again to EDDC about the continued exemption of the Tesco-Bovis site in Seaton from the requirement for affordable housing. However we cannot accept that the land off New Road constitutes an acceptable site for development, even of affordable housing. The field in question constitutes about half of the 'green wedge' between Beer and Seaton at this point, nearest the coast. Development here would fundamentally compromise the separation of the two settlements which is supported by the Local Plan (and the 'Beer Local Gap' policy in your draft plan). Development would also interfere with views of the coast from inland, and so contradict the Local Plan strategy to protect the undeveloped coast. It would spoil the particularly beautiful section of the South West Coastal Path between Seaton Hole and Beer, and so damage the attraction for walkers of the area around Seaton. For all these reasons we are completely opposed to any proposal to include this site for affordable housing in any planning document. Indeed we believe that any such proposal will be rejected because of its incompatibility with the Local Plan. 	<p>See above and acknowledge points supporting objection</p>
<p>SUPPORT</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In favour – avoids ribbon development, less traffic problems and environmentally less dominating. 	<p>See above and acknowledge points supporting but primary objection of non-coalescence takes precedence.</p>