

THEME: NATURAL ENVIRONMENT		
POLICY REF	COMMENT	RESPONSE
NE1/2 Development & the Natural Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hedgerows are increasingly being replaced by fencing in the village. This has very adverse effects on both wildlife and aesthetics. With regard to wildlife – loss of diversity and habitat and connective corridors for wildlife. The loss of visual amenity is emphasised by the topography of the village. Should we not have a policy to resist this trend, if not to reverse it, by both education and enforcement of the need for hedgerow removal orders. 	NE1 protects “valued features” and NE3 refers to Devon Banks, trees and hedges. The policies cover the removal of features governed by planning policy, where a feature or its removal is not covered by planning policy the NP support the retention of natural features
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I would like to see trees, hedges, Devon banks rather than fences. If it is a wall then I would like to see it in local stone or covered in vegetation. New development should include use of local geology e.g. flint, chert or Beer stone. 	As above
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use local stone where possible and plant hedges and trees – no fencing. 	As above

THEME: HERITAGE & BUILT ENVIRONMENT		
POLICY REF	COMMENT	RESPONSE
HBE1 Beer Local Gap	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with the proposal to maintain the gap between Beer and parish boundary with Seaton. 	Clearly supported in HBE1
HBE2 High Quality Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The houses should be designed in keeping with the architecture of the village, using older style features. Designs could take inspiration from cottages in the village, like the fishermen’s cottages for example. Make them look really nice without too much extra cost so people can enjoy living there. (A bit of character, such as stone work, building them from brick, with little gates, roofs with different shapes, not all joined together in one row). A little garden at the front of the houses would look more natural. Also, should be environmentally friendly where possible. 	Covered by HBE2 but must recognise the value of high quality design and that good design whilst recognising historic and local themes need not exclude modern design
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development should be designed with care to look part of the community, not an add-on. Features should be interesting and in-keeping with the village. Adequate space should be created around the properties for gardens and parking, not squeezing extra houses in. 	As above
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development should be integrated into the community, houses that are enjoyable to live in, not just stop-gap or pass-through houses. We need to keep the amount of poor quality housing to a minimum out of respect to our beautiful village and its iconic architecture. 	As above

THEME: HERITAGE & BUILT ENVIRONMENT		
POLICY REF	COMMENT	RESPONSE
HBE2 High Quality Design cont...	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development must be in-keeping with the existing housing in the village, with room to move around the development – not too crowded together. 	As above
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All developments must be in-keeping with the rest of the village and affordable must mean exactly that. 	As above
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any developments could utilise the land in Quarry Lane and beside Short Furlong as it is below the sky line. Any future planning applications must be opposed if the design does not fit Beer – no more monstrosities like the one at the end of Southdown. 	HBE2 but include skyline in iii.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developments should be sympathetic to the traditional historic character. Recently there have been 3 modern, prison like buildings passed, although they may be eco houses they don't fit in with the historic village. 	As HBE2
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Box designs are not in character. The village cannot continue to grow bigger by allowing large scale development 60% for others and 40% for locals. Stop spoiling our village! 	Design issues in HBE2 ratio of homes for locals or others relates to affordable homes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not ignoring contemporary ideas appears to have resulted in some completely out of character buildings being approved. Good architecture can enhance most environments but accepting poor design is to the detriment of the whole village. Stop these recent awful designs being accepted! 	As HBE2

THEME: HERITAGE & BUILT ENVIRONMENT		
POLICY REF	COMMENT	RESPONSE
HBE4 Renewable & low carbon energy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developments should be sustainable with as many of the following features installed as possible: water butts (to collect rainwater), wind turbines on the roof, grass on roofs, electric car charging facilities, recycling facilities, eco-flush toilets, photo-voltaic (and photo thermal) panels, gardens, sustainable and environmentally friendly materials used to build the houses, energy saving appliances encouraged/installed, compost heaps and vegetable patches encouraged to reduce food miles. 	Detailed design requirements controlled by Building Regulations. Some aspects of sustainability impact on planning and where this occurs HBE4 supports renewables etc. Where applications are treated as exceptions to LP policy then introduction of renewable and sustainable features can be conditioned. These conditions cannot be imposed on policy compliant applications
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Houses should be as environmentally friendly as possible – using recycled materials and installation of solar and PV panels. 	As above
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All houses need to be built in the most sustainable way possible. Photo-voltaic and photo thermal panels need to be used. 	As above
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Houses should be as eco friendly as possible with some form of solar capture e.g. PV or thermal. 	As above

THEME: HERITAGE & BUILT ENVIRONMENT		
POLICY REF	COMMENT	RESPONSE
<p>Policy H1 Meeting the demand for local needs housing in Beer Policy H2 Community Housing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Beer is obviously a very desirable place to live and there will always be people, both local and from away, who wish to reside here but there must come a point when to develop any further will seriously damage the character and charm of the village. Any new development should be for local people only on a rental or shared ownership basis, definitely not for holiday or second homes, of which there are already too many in the village. In H1 it says that 50% should be affordable but on the questionnaire it says 40% - will the houses that are not so called affordable still be for people with a local connection? As an alternative to building new properties, why not use the money available to buy existing flats and houses as they come onto the market? This would also help to stop them becoming holiday homes. 	<p>Policy compliant applications i.e. those within the BUAB will be subject to 50% affordable condition. Applications outside of the BUAB, including non compliant applications will be subject to up to 66% affordable. It should be noted that all affordable obligations can be challenged on viability grounds and on this basis Beer PC will accept a reduction down to 40% if it means development will progress and some affordable homes will be delivered</p> <p>We do not believe that at present it is possible to condition all development as being for occupancy by people with a local connection only. Purchase of houses is not a NP matter</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The need for affordable housing in Beer will always be desirable; however there is a point where new development should stop. cont.... 	<p>See above The Pecorama site is a private site and therefore the development is in the hands of the owner</p>

THEME: HERITAGE & BUILT ENVIRONMENT		
POLICY REF	COMMENT	RESPONSE
<p>Policy H1 Meeting the demand for local needs housing in Beer Policy H2 Community Housing cont....</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> cont...Rather than building new dwellings and losing the character of Beer by making it more urbanised, the Community Land Trust, East Devon District Council, Social Housing organisations should explore buying existing properties in Beer for rent and shared ownership as has been done successfully in the past. The Pecorama site in Causeway has been vacant for some time now, can that not be considered? The last time a list of ‘housing need’ was established was 2013, since that time Little Hemphay has been built and some people have found properties elsewhere, it would be assumed the list of names and numbers has changed since that time? If once again the Parish Council goes down the route of supporting the building of more houses, the Parish Council must consider the existing residents of Beer and how it will affect them and not just the people wanting new houses. Whilst I have every sympathy with people wanting to remain in Beer, sometimes we can’t always have what we want. To preserve the character of the village they love, it may be necessary like other generations from Beer before them to buy or rent a property in Seaton or elsewhere in the local area for a time. cont... 	<p>The owner has been approached by the CLT but has no plans to sell or develop at present.</p> <p>The matter of increasing the number of houses in Beer relates to the sustainability of the village. Housing occupancy density is reducing and therefore if the number of houses is not increased then the population will fall</p>

THEME: HERITAGE & BUILT ENVIRONMENT		
POLICY REF	COMMENT	RESPONSE
<p>Policy H1 Meeting the demand for local needs housing in Beer Policy H2 Community Housing cont....</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> cont...Seaton is 5 minutes in a car, walkable and has a good bus service, granted it is not Beer but has proved to be a good stepping stone to living in Beer, whether purchased or waiting for a property to become available for rent. Branscombe has recently been granted planning permission for 9 affordable dwellings and 1 for the open market and could be also used for Beer people. 	<p>The Branscombe issue does not directly impinge on Beer. The actual application is for 6 affordable and 4 market</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not enough 3 bed housing in this village – this is needed as are the 1 bed options for younger people starting out on their own. Accommodation for over 55s, such as bungalows would be nice as not everyone wants a flat. This would free up 3 bed accommodation for families. 	<p>This is covered by H1 and the NP will be used to promote the most effective size and tenure mix</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The CLT successfully built 7 affordable homes; why not another 20? Why should we tolerate 60% un-affordable builds to achieve the number of community houses required? The village cannot adopt large scale development without compromising its unique character and individuality. Look for other ways. 	<p>Unfortunately, affordable houses can only be required in accordance with the LP, the NPPF and planning guidance</p>

THEME: HERITAGE & BUILT ENVIRONMENT		
POLICY REF	COMMENT	RESPONSE
<p>Policy H1 Meeting the demand for local needs housing in Beer Policy H2 Community Housing cont....</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There shouldn't be any development in Beer as there is very little green space left within the village to support a larger community. It would ruin the character of the village and become more like a town and where is the employment for the extra residents? It is not clear how many houses are needed to be built. It seems 27 was the starting figure which has now reduced to 20 but that would only account for 40% of the houses so in total 50 houses have to be built. This has not been made at all clear in the consultation form. Qu 1 implies that if you do not support development of affordable homes then perhaps only non-affordable ones are built but to a lesser degree. 	<p>The HN survey of 2013 identified 27 as a number then. The HN survey number is a guide and not a total to be delivered. The number to deliver depends on the sites available</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please do not allow any more housing in Beer. The village is really in my view incapable of taking any more housing. Where would it end after the next 27 are built? There should be a point at which no more housing is allowed. Where would all the residents work? Do we really want it to be a commuter town? 	<p>See earlier comments</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rented property for locals only. Shared equity (no second homes) not to be sold on open market. 	<p>See earlier comments</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any affordable homes must be for local people. Should not be sold on the open market. 	<p>See earlier comments</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Build bungalows for elderly (2 bed) 	<p>See earlier comments</p>

THEME: TRANSPORT & PARKING		
POLICY REF	COMMENT	RESPONSE
TP1 Protecting car parking capacity TP2 Car parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Beer needs more car parks and also reducing tariffs on some of them because overcrowded, expensive car parks put people off coming to Beer. 	Car park numbers must reflect the mean demand and whilst peak demand does see the Central car park full even then there is space in the Cliff top car park. Parking rates are not an issue for the NP
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Free parking for residents out of season. 	See above
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Why stop bikes parking at Beach Court – they only then take a car parking space. 	This is being addressed within the parking order
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Take control of our own village parking. Safeguard short term street parking for the Fore Street shoppers. Don't prevent motorcycles parking conveniently in locations where cars won't fit. 	Street parking is not a NP issue
TP4 Accessibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This will be difficult to uphold if potential site no 3 is chosen. 	Highways issues relating to specific sites will be considered by the Highways authority
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pedestrianise lower Fore Street, from the Dolphin Hotel to shoreline, using pop-up bollard system to allow deliveries to businesses. This is a common approach in mainland Europe. Also fine people for parking on the pavement in Fore Street. 	This is an issue that has been considered before and opposed by the traders on Fore Street. It also has highways access implications. Whilst not addressed directly by the NP it could be related to HBE3

THEME: BUSINESS & JOBS		
POLICY REF	COMMENT	RESPONSE
B3 Improving internet connectivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Superfast broadband is ok as long as it is affordable. The current ADSL? Broadband in this area is slow and breaks down. I had to change to fibre optic. Including line rental and broadband I now pay over £50 per month to BT. Affordability is the key word. 	B3 supports any development that will help the provision of SFBB

THEME: COMMUNITY FACILITIES & SERVICES		
POLICY REF	COMMENT	RESPONSE
CFS1 Loss of community assets & facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It would be good if the toilets near the Square could be purchased and re-opened – we lose coach parties because there are no toilets up there. 	This is a private matter as the toilets are now privately owned. The NP policy T5 will support measures that could alleviate the issue
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Toilet facilities to be added to the beach. 	This is not a direct NP issue - MS1 would support a development
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide toilet facilities below Charlie's Yard by converting the bunker. 	As above
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of shops recently (last 3 years) is shocking. 	Policy B1 opposes the loss of retail or business space on the Fore Street however issues of viability and private ownership have to be taken into consideration
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A much firmer control protecting retail business outlets needs to be in place before we lose more shops. 	As above
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As well as retaining current shop fronts, consideration should be given to allowing commercial (most probably food and drink) developments in the buildings adjoining the 'fish shop' car park. Could lower rates be a feature in attracting more commercial interest? 	Policy MS1 supports this

THEME: SPORTS & RECREATION		
POLICY REF	COMMENT	RESPONSE
SR1 Protecting our existing sports and recreation facilities and pitches and preventing their loss.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beer’s central play park next to the Jubilee Gardens needs urgent updating. It is so poorly equipped and bare that it is mainly used for adults sitting on benches rather than children playing. Ash Hill play park can be improved to include a skate park for teenagers. 	This is currently an EDDC issue - it may revert to the PC if the proposed asset devolution proposal is enacted in 2017
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should this include the beach as this hosts the sailing and lugger clubs? 	Amended to include the beach
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a tennis court down in the village. 	If a demand can be proven then it can be considered. SR2 supports