



Northam Neighbourhood Development Plan
Northam Town Council
Town Hall
Windmill Lane
Northam
EX39 1BY
Town Clerk – Mrs M J Mills MFLCM
Tel: 01237 474976
E: townclerk@northamtowncouncil.gov.uk



Northam Neighbourhood Development Plan Feedback on draft policies (63 total)

Policies	Page
NNP1 Local Green Spaces	1
NNP2 Prevention of Coalescence between Settlements	4
NNP3 Retaining the character of the rural landscape between settlements	6
NNP4 Protection and Enhancement of Boundaries between Settlements	8
NNP5 Protecting Valued Views	10
NNP6 Protection of Heritage Assets	13
NNP7 Protection of Biodiversity	16
NNP8 Energy Conservation and Carbon Reduction	18
NNP9 Cycle and Pedestrian Routes	20
NNP10 Residential Care and Nursing Homes	22
NNP11 Quality of Design	24
NNP12 Footprint for New, Redeveloped and Replacement Dwellings	27
NNP13 Full-Time Principal Residence Housing (Appledore)	29
NNP14 Parking Provision	32
NNP15 Size of Dwellings	35
NNP16 Broadband	37
NNP17 Business	39
NNP18 Tourism Attractions & Accommodation	41
NNP19 Richmond Dock	44
NNP20 Appledore Shipyard Site	47

Westward Ho! Park should not be built on at all. It should be protected as an LGS...why isn't it by TDC (Thank you Northam TC for recognising it as such).

Should the area around swimming pool, fields, allotments, pitch be included. Also Tors View off Gainsborough Drive. Likewise Kenwith Nature Reserve

Supported

Good news

Agree

In addition to those listed, please include what was previously known as the putting green in Westward Ho! adjacent to the promenade in front of the Latitude 51 development. This is a very important green space for both locals and visitors alike and must be protected

I think you are on the ball what this area needs is our parks and open spaces protecting and enhanced. There is too much development with no consideration for the destruction of people's environment. Living in Westward Ho! it was good to see our park regarded as an open space asset for the people of this village and not a building site. I sincerely hope you manage to acquire it from TDC.

Would include the green area in Irsha St opp. Hilcote Terrace. The Park at Westward Ho! although planning was turned down, this has now been called in and may be overturned!! Include Westward Ho! Putting Green aka The Village Green

Staddon Hill should feature within this category as it is an obvious green area

Green spaces are an invaluable asset and must be maintained and cared for.

I support the policy

Local green spaces should be preserved as they are very precious for community use and wildlife corridors. Development near these sites should be resisted.

Not many left

I support this policy

Good that these areas are protected

Agree

Agree

Agree

Very important

I quite agree with this aim of keeping these areas 'green'

As good as far as it goes in protecting existing green spaces. I would like the policy to try to encourage further designation of protected green spaces where possible and appropriate. e.g the play area between Kimberley Park and Diddywell.

Westward Ho! Village Green Land beyond the car park at the end of Merley Rd. W/Ho! (below Kipling Tors) Land at the top of Windmill Lane walking down towards Boathyde on right and left hand side (Private land)

massively important

Should not the Borough Farm allotments and field also be designated as a green space? It is essential that the 1069 Battlefield is protected as a green space and no further development encouraged at Knapp House, THEY have NO respect for the environment and would happily concrete over it ALL for cash, it is shameful that they have been allowed to build a small village there as 'holiday homes'. TDC should NOT have buckled under pressure. I am pleased that the local green spaces are being protected as the community and visitors need to be able to find green spaces.

Exceptional circumstances are open to interpretation! We need to retain our green spaces! Please include the football field in Appledore and the fields between Tadworthy Road and Golf Links Road (See NNP7)

Agree

Appledore Football Club, Sandymere Football Club, Churchfields play area and skatepark, and Lords Meadow Playpark in Northam should be included in this list.

Support all. Include Appledore Football Ground and make sure all footpaths and the coastal path are protected.

Agree with policy. We should try and increase the number of publicly accessible green spaces.

Support

Ensure that footpaths including the coastal path are protected.

Include the Appledore football ground.

It should read "development that erodes the value.... will not be permitted"

I am supportive of this policy

We need to keep as many green spaces as possible for relaxation and mental health of residents and visitors

Agree on all locations in and around Appledore

I agree with the green spaces allocated, but would like the further inclusion of the fields off Staddon Road - green spaces rapidly being diminished. These areas should NEVER be developed.

Essential that we retain the beauty of our area. I have lived in the district for over 80 years we have lost some of our precious views

Green spaces in Northam such as football pitch to east of Torridge Swimming Pool and allotment field Windmill Lane

Support

Agree. Include Appledore FC ground.

I support this Policy - green spaces are important for people and wildlife.

Object : The land shown as Knapp Wood is in use as an Activity Centre. It has a planning use as a caravan park for caravans and an authorised use for static homes. A planning permission has recently been approved for holiday homes. The inclusion of Knapp Wood in this allocation is not acceptable. The drawn line goes through the existing curtilage of Knapp house. Bisecting the grounds that have an established holiday and commercial use. Also cutting out the 18 lawful use residential units, and cutting out the septic tank and areas such as the assault course, initiative exercise area, tunnelling area, Frisbee area, orienteering and kite flying that have been used as part of the activity centre for more than 10 years. The existing house and its curtilage buildings all have an extant residential use. The surrounding areas all have an established and co-existent use as ancillary areas to the activity centre. In totality approximately 53 acres are 'brownfield / existing uses' and cannot reasonably be designated 'local green spaces'. Most of the 53 acres is used regularly and all of it is used occasionally. Agree and also would like to see the additions of Appledore Football ground, Churchfields Play area, Appledore Woods and Wooda Woods - these should also be protected and Bidna, Goats Hill and Limers Lane coastal area/footpaths.

Please add Grid Reference SS4605229896, this being the start of the Public Right of Way (PROW) from Pitt Hill to the Coastal Footpath, which crosses amazing open countryside and is used by a high volume of local residents of varying ages, rambling groups and other social groups for recreational purposes, walking and dog walking, thus promoting physical and mental well being and awareness of the countryside.

The whole of the remaining 'Putting Green' area between the promenade and Latitude 51 development, should be included as a Local Green Space. This public open space was reduced in size by the development, and then the 'Village Square' supposedly provided for the community as part of the development, was demolished and sold for development. What remains of the 'Green' including the paved footpath in front of the buildings should be protected.

The grass meadow area beyond Seaford House should surely also be designated a Local Green Space. It is one of Westward Hol's public open spaces heavily used by local residents and visitors, a level area with beautiful views out and a species rich grass sward. This meadow has already been recently encroached by a carpark extension, which also grubbed up a length existing species rich hedge adjacent to the old railway footpath. The area should be designated to ensure there is no further loss.

I agree

Agree

Fully agree. But what about adding the allotments and football pitch in Northam behind the swimming pool

1 - Please add Public Footpath Number 4 51 02'55" N 4 11' 51" W and 51 02'53"N 4 11'50"W

The paths connection to the South West Coast Path National Trail and the local circular walks using the path, provides a valuable green space used by hundreds of local walkers, rambling groups and visitors. Walking as a means to improve physical and mental health is so important and where better to do this than in the beautiful open countryside of Appledore. And it's free for all to enjoy.

Whilst Public Rights of Way (PROW), do have protection as public highways, they can be legally diverted or even extinguished by greedy developers. Please do not let this happen to this valuable resource.

2 - The woodland on the south west coastal path between Wooda Road and Bidna Lane. 51 02'44" N 4 11'48" W

Agree on all locations in and around Appledore

Agreed

the old putting green (on the seafront at Westward Ho#1 in front of Latitude 52) should be included. Also the entire Tors area - beginning to end in WWHo!
Not a green space but Public Toilets in WWHo! need to be protected.

I believe that Northam cannot and should not be 'lumped in' with Westward Ho! There are only a few fields between the two settlements (off Tadworthy Lane) that now separate the two. These should be protected, otherwise the two settlements are completely joined.

Excellent

supported

Reassuring to see this on a map

Agree

I believe it is important to protect the rural gap between our communities and preserve their identities

I think this is very important. Or we will become one big metropolitan area. People who live here do not want that and people moving in are trying to get away from that type of environment .

Good idea - see answer for NNP10

Very sensible plan.

I support the policy

Development that would turn the three individual villages into just another soul-less urban sprawl must be resisted. The history and character of the three settlements is valuable and should be preserved.

See NNP4

I support this policy

Agree

Agree

agree

Yes

It is so hard in these times to keep areas separate with their own defined boundaries. I fully support this aim.

OK

massively important

Very important to keep 'village identities'

no further development should be encouraged at Knapp House, THEY have NO respect for the environment and would happily concrete over it ALL for cash, it is shameful that they have been allowed to build a small village there as 'holiday homes' . TDC should NOT have buckled under pressure

Each community should be kept separated by these green areas so they remain distinct communities.

Boundaries need to be retained between settlements to keep the character of individual villages.

Developments that respect the need for green fields between Appledore and Northam and Northam and Westward Ho! should be encouraged. Please can we say that any development that contributes to coalescence will be strongly resisted

Agree

Land around Woode road, Pitt lane and Churchill way currently provide clear boundaries between appledore and Northam & therefore should not be developed.

Support..

Please make the maps clearer.
Insert 'strongly' before 'resisted'.

Agree with policy.

Support

Please clarify the maps
Insert "strongly" before "resisted"

I am supportive of this policy

I strongly disagree with the coalescence of settlements, they are individual areas with their own identity
Distinctive identities of settlements essential

Thoroughly agree with NNP2. The identities of settlements is rapidly being eroded to the detriment of the entire area. What about disaster Knapp joining Appledore and Northam - should be prevented

Agreed

Strongly Support

Agree.

~ I strongly support this Policy - particularly to retain the gap between Appledore and Northam, as well as Northam/Westward Ho! and Bldeford/Orchard Hill.

Object : Map B2 does not recognise the lawful uses that exist at Knapp. Development at Knapp would not in any event 'join up' the settlements as they are separated by the open fields and allotments at Bloody Corner. Furthermore development along Churchill Way already exists such that development on the opposite side of JH Taylor Drive would not worsen the existing position.

Agree

I agree

Agree

Fully agree and hope anything else will be fully resisted.

Distinctive identities of settlements essential

Agreed

~ Absolutely essential

b) & other established footpaths. We do not want to walk thru fenced corridors on previous open footpaths supported

The protection of these elements (the setting, rural character, dark skies etc) is essential and should be seen as such, not just 'nice to haves'

Agree

This is very important if North Devon is to retain its beauty.

Very important.

Any development on Staddon Hill would detract from the unspoilt character of this area

Rural landscape is important both as 'green lungs' for residents and an attraction for visitors.

I support the policy

Retaining the character of the three settlements will be very difficult if much development is allowed to take place, developers can be very Cavalier. Retaining the rural atmosphere, appearance, dark skies and tranquility of the areas will be nigh on impossible with destruction of green field sites, street lights too many cars for the narrow estate roads and more pollution.

Westward Ho! Has no greenery whatsoever just a mass of concrete. What happened to all the trees, hedges etc.

I support this policy

Agree

Agree

agree

Very important

The character of the rural landscape must be retained.

OK But Map needs to take account of recent development at The Mount, Appledore next to Blackies. massively important

please confirm ALL 3 allotment sites are registered as green spaces

I am glad to see that consideration will be made as to whether development is necessary and that any development will be in keeping with the rural atmosphere.

The character of the rural landscape needs to be retained.

Agree

ANY development within the area will detract from the unspoilt character, rural atmosphere and appearance, dark skies and tranquility of the area. The rural landscape is already minimal. Further developments need to stop!

Support.

Remove the word 'detract' and insert 'in keeping'.

Agree with policy.

Support

a) Remove the word "detract" and replace with 'in keeping'
Please make reference to Undeveloped Coast protection

I am supportive of this policy

The character of the rural landscapes are vitally important for the health of the residents

Just do it

agree on NNP3 comments

Disagree. There should be no development between settlements - no exceptions - development should be refused and re-located to another area

Agreed. Let us not destroy the very thing we value by excessive development intruding on natural boundaries

(a) what does "dark skies" mean in this context

Support.

Consider undeveloped coast protection

Agree. Include statement to resist development that affects the setting of, or access to, land in National Trust ownership at Burrough Farm.

(c) add after 'affect access to SW Coast Path' - 'as well as other public rights of way'.

I am not sure I understand this Policy - I don't think new development should be located outside the defined settlement boundaries, unless there are very exceptional circumstances. If there is to be development then I support clauses a), b), and c).

Object : Map B2 does not recognise the lawful uses that exist at Knapp.

Agree and also with the addition for no new buildings to be erected on the green high fields which could risk the change of views on the area skyline.

I strongly agree

Agree

Agree

Agree on NNp3 comments

Agreed

As above

Excellent

supported

Yes, let's continue to add to what we have, not just preserve what little is left

Agree

AS above

Good idea.

Boundaries are very important as there must be 'full stops' between villages or else we will become like the suburbs of Bidaford.

Support

If development has to take place in this area Map B2 every effort must be made by the council to oversee the work being done complies with the councils demands for conservation of the natural landscape and the planting of the correct tree and hedgerow species. I would prefer these area to be left untouched by builders.

Extremely important. Soon will be a vast urban sprawl...!

I support this policy

Agree

Agree

Agree

Agree

agree

Yes

Yes the whole of NNP4 should be adhered to.

ok

All housing developments should incorporate green space, trees and hedgerows. This is especially important in W/Ho because new build have no or very little garden.

massively important

The conservation and restoration of earth banks & hedgerows will be in keeping and will also protect the natural ecosystems of the countryside and encourage wildlife to thrive.

Trees and Hedgerows keep the character of our boundaries!

Please can we specify native trees

Agree

Support.

Include the use of native trees etc.

Agree with policy. Native trees and hedgerow species should always be used. Trees only if appropriate species and do not block views.

Support

Please include use of native trees

Should read "native tree and hedgerow species"

I am supportive of this policy

Hedges and boundaries should be protected and enhances for local flora and fauna

Just do it

Our lanes, hedgerows and boundaries are essential to maintain rural character

Agree - existing hedges and traditional stone walls must be retained or replaced. Suburban type fences are not traditional Devon - the traditional devon hedges should be listed

agreed

Support

Agree. Delete 'where feasible,' add-'planting of native broadleaf tree and hedge species, as well as wild flora, to be of regional provenance as far as possible'.

Also add that existing hedgerows to be protected and retained wherever possible in accordance with The Hedgerow Regulations 1997.

I support this Policy and the use of appropriate native species for both landscape and wildlife reasons - to provide green corridors.

Object : Map B2 does not recognise the lawful uses that exist at Knapp.

Agree

I agree

Agree

Agree

our lanes, hedgerows and boundaries and essential to maintain rural characters

Agreed

essential for conservation of our environment for future generations

Tors View also preserving rural view of high points both within and outside the area.

supported

This is important to our own local pride and pleasure as well as being a commercially important aspect of tourism - the definition of what may spoil something e.g., massing seems somewhat subjective unless there is a technical way of quantifying this that a Torridge planning team might apply?

AGREE

Please include the public open space area at the top of Cornborough (accessed via Armada Way adjacent to Tors View) as this is a lovely open space with amazing/spectacular vistas. This area needs to be preserved for future generations and not allowed to fall into the hands of unscrupulous developers.

AS above. Once a much loved view is destroyed it is gone forever.

Would also include green land in Irsha St opp. Hillcliff Terrace. People of Westward Ho! would question their views being protected when high rise blocks of holiday/2nd homes are allowed to be built, ruining not only their views but the general appearance of the 'village'.

Include the top of Windmill Lane looking down towards Boathyde

If Staddon Hill experiences any development this is bound to have a significant visual impact on the landscape and will be seen locally as well as across the water from Instow, Crow Point, Northam Burrows etc

Views are part of the areas natural and never changing asset and must be protected.

Support

Protecting valued views is a difficult subject for us, as we are near the proposed development at Daddon Hill. The landscape from the hill towards the A39 will be turned into an encroaching cancer, the same is happening the other side of the A39 between Biddeford and Atlantic Village, both developments are on farm land which I find very disappointing. So, I find the councils hope to protect the Valued Views Map 3 encouraging.

I support this policy

Restrictions on the number of stories to a property will retain character

Agree

Agree

agree

Important

All valued views should be protected

ok

No further high rise flats or houses in Westward Ho! which would block views of the sea/pebbleridge No housing developments along Merley Rd on the right hand side leading out to Pier House. Currently used as Caravan Parks.

Land beyond the car park at the end of Merley Rd. W/Ho! leading out towards the path along the cliffs.

Land at the top of Windmill Lane walking down towards Boathyde on right and left hand sides - spectacular views looking down to the river, and across the river (private land) before you get to National Trust land.

Land at Skern in Appledore (seaward side) should not be built on to protect the views of the river, the skern and beyond.

Land on the left hand side of Broad Lane (going down from the top of the road). Currently you can see across to Hartland point, Lundy Island, Northam Burrows and on a fine day can even see Clovelly.

massively important

westward hol is an amazing example of HOW NOT TO BUILD!! visitors are astounded that permission was given for such a monstrous development

It is good that certain areas and valued views will be protected as they benefit local communities and tourists. These areas add to of this neighbourhood.

Views need to be retained to enhance where we live!

Please include the view from the Mount at the top of Staddon Road.

Agree

Support.

Please add Staddon Road looking West towards Northam Burrows and the view to the North and North-West, also the views from Anchor Park towards Richmond Dock and the views from Village Green.

Agree with policy. Note above also applies here. Distinctive views of the area, for example from across the river should also be protected. This should apply to all developments. View from Tapeley and coastal paths for example.

Support

Please add view from Staddon Road looking West towards Northam Burrows and the view to the north and north-west and view from Anchor Park towards Richmond Dock.

Also the view from the Village Green and the view from above the Visitor Centre at Northam Burrows over towards Saunton and Appledore

Should read "blends into the environment"

I am supportive of this policy

NNP5 is ambiguous. The first and last paragraph are contradicting. No man-made development can 'enhance' the distinctive views mentioned. The wording must be less weak and the "development will be supported" paragraph should be re-written with mention of Biosphere and SSSIs.

Very important, they're necessary for people of all ages to escape the stress of life

Just do it

View to Tapley from green field. View from Anchor Park to estuary / Richmond Dock. View from green (The backfield) - Panoramic view over estuary to Tapley and beyond

Agree. Visitors to the area come to admire the scenery and not a housing estate. Even 1 house can destroy the joy hundreds of people feel. Add to this the fields with views in Staddon Road and Skern field

Agreed. They have been forgotten in WWHol the huge height of flats has obscured the visual impact of the Tors

Windmill Lane, field gate on northside and east end of houses looking north and north east over the historically recorded site of the Battle of Northam 1069AD

Support

Protect view from Appledore Village Green

Protect view from the lookout across Northam Burrows, also views to north and west from this vantage point

Agree. Also add statement to the effect that 'in addition, development within views towards Tapely House that are detrimental to both its setting and /or detrimental to views looking back from The House shall be resisted.'

I strongly support this Policy.

ject : Map B3 does not recognise the lawful uses that exist at Knapp. More specifically c) and e) are not acceptable.

Agree and with also the additions of protected views from Pimpley Bridge, Northam Burrows looking East towards Churchill Way, Appledore Village Green towards Tapley Park, Westleigh and Bideford Bridge.

Please add Grid Reference SS4575429618, the Old Windmill between Bidna and Wooda, in all directions. It provides amazing 360 degree views of Northam and Appledore from an historic site of interest accessible from a Public Right Of Way.

Also please add Grid Reference SS4609829512, the view from the Public Right of Way over Appledore Shipyard towards Pitt Hill and beyond.

Please add the view from Tapley Park over to Pitt Hill and the landscape around and above the Shipyard. It's stunning and housing development would detract from the enjoyment of a Heritage Asset.
I strongly agree

Agree

Agree with the addition of Village Green, Appledore

1 - The views looking North West, North and North East from the site of the old Windmill above Bidna 51 02'42"N 4 12'06"W

2 - The views looking West, North West, North and North East from the South West Coast Path above the shipyard - 51 02'41"N 4 11'47"W

3 - The views from Tapley Park House and Gardens looking West, South West and North West over to the shipyard and surrounding countryside, to ensure that future development does not harm the setting of this Grade 2 Historic England Heritage Asset, for the same reasons as proposed in NNP20

View to Tapley from greenfield/Richmond. View from Anchor Park to estuary. Dock view from the Backfield - panoramic views over the estuary to Tapeley and beyond

Agreed

Hopefully this will be adhered to as some recent developments seems to have escaped this policy!

supported

Do we need to name certain assets, without excluding other examples, to ensure their protection for the future (Dry Dock, duly noted)?

Agree

Seafield House is a very important landmark building in Hol and known the world over. I realise it is in private ownership but it is worth mentioning here in the hope that it can achieve a heritage status to preserve the building. In addition, the Kingsley Community Hall is a very important building in our community. Upper Lodge and Lower Lodges and other old/significant buildings in Hol should be considered for preservation.

AS above

Agree - what about protecting the unique status of Northam Burrows from flooding and coastal erosion (also pollution by the Old Tip spilling into the sea).

Northam Old School, The Square, Kingsley Hall, Holy Trinity Church, Seafield House, Westward Hol St Marys Church and Maritime Museum, Appledore

Staddon Hill is a heritage site and a full archaeological survey has yet to be done

Must be preserved and carefully considered in all planning applications.

Support

Heritage Assets can be difficult to redevelop without losing the actual heritage aspect of the site, Northam Council will have to stick very tightly to the proposed policies to make sure these valued Assets are not lost in the convoluted process of development planning.

I support this policy

Agree

Agree

agree

Important

Heritage assets are being swamped by over-development and do need to be protected

ok

Bloody Corner and the plaque 'Stop stranger Stop'

massively important

it is essential that the 1069 Battlefield is protected as a green space and no further development encouraged at Knapp House, THEY have NO respect for the environment and would happily concrete over it ALL for cash, it is shameful that they have been allowed to build a small village there as 'holiday homes', TDC should NOT have buckled under pressure
Boundaries that are restored and preserved will enhance the area and help it not to lose its heritage and natural beauty.

All such assets need protection but point b is open to interpretation and I am not sure how point c will be policed? I am unclear as to how points E and F will also be policed?

Agree

Support

Please include list of sites on the plan.

Agree with policy.

Support

Please include list of sites in the plan

(f) should read "and proposes the use of vernacular design"

New buildings need to be energy efficient. Traditional materials will not meet modern building control requirements.

I am supportive of this policy

Part F should state type of development. 'Local' materials include cob and lime render. Mention should also be made on the Appledore Conservation Area

This is vital for our children of the present and future to help them understand a little of our history

Just do it

Support all comments made

Agree with this but what about Knapp Battlefield?

Agree

Site of battle of Northam 1069AD, centred on Marshford and valleys to east and west. Strong historical evidence but no archaeological evidence yet available

Support

Include A LIST OF THE RELEVANT SITES IN THE PLAN

Agree

I support this Policy.

Object : The Local Heritage Assets should be shown as an attachment as they do appear on the NTC website. There is no proven 'heritage asset' at or connected with Knapp.

Where it states in the first line "enhancement of heritage assets", it could be added "such as the grade II* listed Richmond Dock"

Agree with also the additional of protection of the area where Chanters Folly stood and also protection of the civil war fort at top of Riversmeet.

Please add the view from Tapeley Park over to Pitt Hill and the landscape around and above the Shipyard. It's stunning and housing development would detract from the enjoyment of a Heritage Asset.

Also the protection of the old Windmill at grid reference SS4575429618.

The remains of the old bridge of the Bideford, Westward Ho!, Appledore Light Railway at the west end of Horizon View should be protected as a Heritage Asset (see Tourism Attractions below.)

Please also protect the well- loved Pavilion in Westward Ho! Park as a heritage asset.

I agree

Agree

Agree

Support all comments made

Agreed

I strongly feel that Seafield House and Kingsley Hall should be protected under this policy

supported

I do not accept there is any case for destroying habitat of species under threat.

Agree

I agree with the report

see NNP6

Typo C should read non-statutory not none-statutory

In an area which contains sites of special scientific interest this is vitally important.

Support

Protection of Biodiversity is important for the enhancement of the local area and the future of life on this planet. I therefore commend the councils endeavour to police the protection of Biodiversity. However I do not see how Biodiversity and Building Development can ever sit comfortably side by side as with the best will in the world one usually destroys the other.

The pebble ridge by sand dunes needs shoring up with large boulders to prevent further erosion of the burrows.

I support this policy

Agree

Agree

agree

Important

The Biodiversity in this part of our County is magnificent and should be retained

No Map attached re green corridors so can't comment effectively.

All developments should produce an Environmental Impact Assessment

massively important

Need more to protect the 'dark sky'. Important for many local habitats for Barn Owls, Badgers and Hedgehogs.

I feel encouraged that biodiversity is being considered and protected in this way.

I am in agreement with the points raised here.

The fields between Tadworthy Road and Golf Links Road are rich in wildlife and this should be respected and preserved

Agree

Support. Please make sure that the maps are included.

Please include wildlife corridor through fields between Tadworthy Road and Golf Links Road.

Agree with policy. The areas need to be marked on the maps. This should apply to all developments within or outwith the built up areas.

pport

ase ensure maps included

> include wildlife corridor through fields between Tadworthy Road and Golf Links Road

It is essential that this is backed up by fact. Too subjective. An ecological survey specialist needs to do a report and research. Very well worth paying for.

I am supportive of this policy

Very important for the conservation of Earth. We need hedges, trees etc for the lessing of carbon dioxide

Yes

Comment should be made of our wildlife which is not always obvious as the animals hide in their habitat. We should not destroy those habitats

Agree with this

Agree

can we insert "development proposals will be supported provided that they do not adversely affect the quality of the water in the sea or the estuary"

Support

Agree

I strongly support this Policy. It would be helpful to identify the non-statutory wildlife sites referred to in clause c) on a map within the Plan.

Object : lack of clarity. Where is the Map referred to as 'Map (*)'? Where is Appendix E? What is in Appendices A – D ?

Agree

In all of the above grid reference numbers

I agree

Agree

Agree

Please add;

1 - Northam Public footpath Number 4.

2 - The woodland on the South West Coast Path between Wooda Road and Bidna Lane

Supporting photographic evidence can be provided in all cases, if required,

Much should be made of our wildlife which is not always obvious as the animals hide in their habitat we mustn't destroy this

Agreed

Agree

Likely conflict of support for solar panels and preservation of conservation areas.

supported

This is encouraging but does not seem to have any targets or specific ambitions attached. I suspect as a result it will have no impact.

Agree

Please consider insisting on the inclusion of solar panels and the use of green energy suppliers for all new planning applications whether they be commercial or dwellings. It might be worth considering excluding the use of wood burners given the harm they are doing to our health and environment.

I agree with the report.

Agree

Include grey water recycling in new build

This is now a very important consideration.

Support

Climate Change has made the conservation of energy and use of green energy important so I commend the Council's plans for energy efficiency. It is common knowledge however that some Developers houses are of such poor construction conserving energy is nigh on impossible. I therefore urge the Council to scrupulously oversee the construction of any new developments to make sure they meet energy efficiency standards.

I support this policy

Agree

Agree

agree

Yes

I do support energy conservation but I am not a fan of windmills. They are intrusive and a blot on the landscape

OK

Developers should be encouraged to put in water recycling facilities on all new housing developments
massively important

Pleased that conservation of energy and pollution reduction is being considered for this beautiful community.

This is great as long as it does not impinge on policies NNP1 through to NNP5

More electric charging points for cars and especially in car parks should be encouraged and in the case of housing developments should be a requirement for each house. There is nothing at the moment and this appears to be the way the world is going

Agree

Support

Please include reference to SW Marine Plan. Also charging points within developments.

Agree with policy. There is no reason why all new buildings do not have solar panels and water heating facilities on their roof tops.

Support

Please include reference to SW Marine Plan.

Also Electric charging points within developments and in car parks

b) alternative energy generation systems should be encouraged where it is not in conflict with other environmental policies

I am supportive of this policy

NNP8 Should also mention trying to reduce car pollution by building cycle routes (see NNP9) and better waiting facilities of bus passengers.

Any housing developments should/must take into account the green issue ie solar panels

Yes

Support comments

Agree

Agree

Support.

S.W Marine plan?

Agree

I support this Policy, particularly solar panels on all new houses.

Object : Planning policies should not refer to matters that are controlled by other legislation, particularly Building Regulations. Government policy & Building Regulations will dictate the standard of construction.

Agree

I agree

Agree

Agree, particularly solar panels

Support comments

Very woolly and politically motivated towards unproven theories of the extreme green policies. Carbon, carbon zero conflicts with the use of wood burners and will not be taken seriously. I object.

To include electric charge points for cars

- a) Proposals to protect, upgrade
b) No to cycle track along Coastal Path, pedestrians and cyclists not a good idea sharing this narrow path along cliff edge. Cyclists could use route from Kenwith until track crosses Comborough Road and then continue that way.

supported

The requirements for new developments are good. I am concerned that opening up Comborough to cycle traffic will destroy its unique character and turn this section of coast path into a mountain biking pleasure, destroying habitat, biodiversity and the peace of the area, currently so easily accessed from Westward Ho!

Agree

I am in favour of cycle and pedestrian routes where possible. Given the "move" towards more of these, I would urge you to include something in this Plan about the preservation/retention and need for retaining the public conveniences we currently have and, if possible, the addition of more. Given that we are an ageing population and people of all ages are being encouraged to exercise more, it makes sense to look at what is effectively infrastructure for cycle and pedestrian routes. This should therefore take into account the provision of sufficient public conveniences as these will encourage more people to use the path and cycle ways.

This is very important as it adds to peoples quality of life.

Agree

The area is lucky to have part of the southwest coastal path and the Tarka trail as cycle lanes near main roads. They are very important for both residents and visitors.

Support

The development and preservation of these routes is important, I hope the Council will be able to meet its objectives.

I support this policy

Agree

Agree

agree

Yes

All well and to the good for the area

No Map B4 attached. The policy could include the future development of new footpaths & bridleways by the use of permissive paths. That may be implied in condition a).

massively important

Building safer pathways for pedestrians and cyclists will improve safety for everyone using the roads and lanes. Possibly reducing the use of cars as well.

Great Idea to encourage walking and bikes

Please could attention also be given to providing more bridleways. There are many horse riders in the area whose needs are not met. Better provision on the Burrows and better access to the beach could be encouraged

Agree

The bus provision needs to be improved between Appledore and Bideford and Appledore and Westward Ho.

Support.

Map B4 is missing.

Development of more bridle-ways is needed.

Agree with policy. All developments, existing and new, should be for the benefit of people - not cars or capital. A cycle path and footpath should be added to the route over the bridge from Haywood roundabout to connect the area with the Tarka trail. People do walk over the bridge now. It would be much safer with a proper footpath.

Support

Map B4 is missing

Please include development of more bridleways

Bike racks in ? please. Extending the cycle routes: contact sustrans on this. They are very helpful

I am supportive of this policy

The policy objective should mention sustrans the charity that builds cycleways for little or no cost (rather than wait years for developers to pay for it). Also, how about a path linking Heywood road Roundabout - Tarka Trail via Torridge Bridge

Important for health and enjoyment and safety

Waste of resources

This needs careful consideration to increase safety for pedestrians should even more traffic/use of roads happen

Agree and would like to see a cycle way between Appledore and Bideford in addition

Agree Where safety is required

Support

Agree

I strongly support this Policy. Additionally the Plan should promote a shared cycle-way/ footpath from Heywood roundabout over the bridge and on down the slip-road to join the Tarka Trail. This would be a valued improvement as it is currently dangerous and hence off-putting.

Object : There is no Map B4?

Agree

I agree

Agree

Agree

It requires carefully consideration to increase safety for pedestrians. Should much more traffic use of roads happens

Agree with public footpaths, bridleways but not cycleways - again politically motivated and providing new homes for our essential services cannot be dependent upon providing "cycleways"

Strongly Agree

supported

The recognition of need for open space encourages me greatly.

Agree

Again, we are an ageing population and therefore there is a need for more residential care and nursing homes. However, no consideration has been given to the impact a recently built care home here in Ho! Primrose House is a lovely facility BUT there was no consideration given to the parking needs of 24 hour staff, visitors and the frequent ambulance visits. We therefore have major parking issues on Atlantic Way with cars blocking both sides of the road (there is another care home opposite unfortunately). Pulling out of Avon Lane is to take your life in your hands as cars are now parking down Avon Lane and right up to the corner of it on Atlantic Way blocking your view and requiring you to pull out into the middle of the road where you often meet traffic head on to you and, given the large numbers of cars parked, there is nowhere for you to pull in to allow them or you to pass. It's disgraceful. Parking needs for staff and visitors MUST be considered and accommodated in future applications.

Agree with the report

How did the development of building of old peoples flats/homes get approved for Marsh Farm Northam Rd Bideford - a flood area and in the area for preventing coalescence between settlements? Map B2.

Adequate on- site parking for staff and visitors. Support Assisted living accommodation as provided at Moreton Court Bideford by Sanctuary Housing

An Important asset.

Support

Residential Care Homes are important and I hope the Council can meet its objectives here.

I support this policy

Agree

Agree

agree

Important

Certainly any new development of care/nursing homes will need to meet this aim.

ok

All new residential and nursing homes must have adequate parking on site for staff and visitors to prevent parking on our narrow busy roads.

All new homes to meet any build standards recommended or suggested as good practice by the Care Quality Commission and Devon County Council (Social Care) - Atlantic Way is particularly hazardous where care home workers park on the roadside.

decent standards needed

I am pleased that guidelines are in place for developments of residential care facilities but recognise that these facilities will be become increasing necessary as our population ages and needs support.

Great Need for provision for our aging population although I think more should go into keeping older people healthier for longer.

Agree

Support.
Query about bed space per bed.
General agreement with policy.

Support

Map B4 is missing

We have a query about the amount of space per bed space of amenity space and suggest that this should be further researched. It will also be dependant on the number of beds in the home.

C is overly restrictive

I am supportive of this policy

With the ageing population it's vitally important that any care/nursing homes that are built include green spaces so the residents can enjoy relaxation

Yes

Appreciated

I have not enough knowledge to comment

Parking for visitors should be part of planning consent. Primrose and Blebeli Homes on WWHo! are causing problems with 'on road' parking

Support

Agree

Object : a) Residential Care & Nursing Homes need not be within the development boundary. They should be 'within the development boundary or well related to the settlements that they serve'. Policy a) does not comply with Government Policy or the recently adopted North Devon & Torridge local Plan.
b) This policy requirement is too prescriptive. Each & every development will provide an appropriate amount of amenity space.

I agree

Agree with (a) and (b) However not sure if (c) is necessary or enforceable

Agree

Appreciated

Not the business of self-appointed neighbourhood groups to decide what size, type, and design of much needed nursing homes - this is an over-reach of the spirit of neighbourhood plan.

We already seem to have a high level of care/supported living accommodation in WWHo! any additional premises should have adequate parking in WWHo! for staff and visitors as parking in WWHo! is already a problem especially at holiday times, causing disruption for local residents

(after appropriate effective landscape) acknowledging the harsh sea side environment, resulting in strong salt winds effecting both choice of species and rate of growth of trees and bushes as well as maintenance of painted surfaces. (Too many architect plans are softened by trees even when it is well known that they are attempting to plant when there is insufficient soil and exposure to salt winds means that the trees will fail to thrive!)

supported

Perfect!

Agree

The problem we have in Hol is that permission was granted and developments built that are inappropriate and ugly developments of all shapes and sizes. No consideration was given to purpose and place or to what the local community wanted, our "vision" if you like. As a result, the problem we now have is that it will be hard to argue against any particular type of development being built in the future.

However, trying to be optimistic, I would urge you to consider purpose and place - purpose perhaps to build permanent, full-time occupied homes to fit local residents needs. These new dwellings should be "protected" if they are social housing therefore retaining rental stock or low-cost housing should tenants/owners want to move on.

At the consultation, we were told that the steering group would like to try and ensure that larger plots are secured. I agree with that and would go so far as to suggest we look back to the old council house principles of being a good sized plot for people to enjoy leisure space or grow their own produce, that the homes have decent sized rooms and be properly/solidly built and that each area has an open space and whatever facilities were deemed necessary given size and purpose of development.

Most importantly, before ANY permissions are granted, we have to deal with the issue of infrastructure. Our water and sewerage system isn't coping, BT are struggling to maintain basic telephone line provision let alone cope with demand for fast broadband using antiquated equipment that is not fit for the purpose. Then there is the issue of Doctors, schools, public transport and our roadways amongst other things and these all need to be addressed and preferably in place before anything else is built.

As above

How does this work for Westward Ho! - what a mess of different types of buildings - too high, too big, too expensive, squashed in every small space, poor quality of materials for the Sea spray. Nothing matches - ugly!!

Some of the buildings which have been erected in Westward Ho are lacking in design as they do not fit in with their surroundings.

Support

Quality of house design is important and I hope the Council can live up to its ideals on this subject. The local housing estates I have seen bare very little comparison to the Councils vision of perfect housing stock. Being very closely packed in, narrow roads with cars parked everywhere as there isn't enough length of "drive" to the properties to park them on. Poor design just leads to estates look hideous in the panoramic view as stated in NNPS

I support this policy

Agree

Agree

Very important

Contractors would need to be bound by theses aims, too many pay lip service to the promises and renege on the deal.

Width of roads in new developments is important especially regarding on-street parking (This may be covered under NNP14). Too many new developments have very narrow roads (developers prefer saleable land) causing difficulties when there is on-street parking which will inevitably occur despite most properties having a garage or off-street parking.

too many crap builds

all the houses look the same and are shoddy cheap builds at expensive prices

Glad that further structural developments will have stricter controls on materials, impact on the environment around them and also whether they blend in with the existing architecture of each community.

This is all open to interpretation and tree lined streets are not usually on developers plans.

Agree

Support

Specify minimum width of residential streets. Houses should be built to ensure consistency with local character.

There are design statements for the settlements. Appledore for example should retain a Village Design concept as outlined in the Design Statement. I am not sure how the proposed terrace on Churchill Way as part of the Pitt Hill development fits into this.

Support

Please specify minimum width of residential streets. Houses should be built in 'vernacular style' to ensure consistency with local character

Good modern design should be encouraged. This can be combined with a vernacular twist and adds interest. "Good" architecture is subjective, tighten this up.

I am supportive of this policy

The problem with NNP11 is it is just not strong enough, i.e. (a) developers can "accidentally" fell a tree... (b) what kind of trees? Leylandii? (c) "where possible" = not at all. How many new homes are built with lath + plaster and cob? (d) every developer will say that their proposals are "visually attractive..." etc. Who is it to judge? NNP11 should be less ambiguous

Must ensure that adequate parking is included in any buildings and to fit in with the area

NTC do not know what quality design even means. The kitsch boats a good example

(Appledore) Essential with so many developers grabbing land with opportunities to ruin what is essentially a small fishing village atmosphere

Design such as Knapp development should not be permitted - plastic wood and steel is inappropriate in Devon rural area

No more grey houses please

Support

Buildings should be in keeping with the character of the surroundings

Agree. Add to (a) 'Proposals must include supporting information, to include a detailed Design and Access Statement'. Add (e) 'Detailed Landscape Proposals for any development must be supported by a Plan of Ongoing Landscape Management, which identifies how this will be implemented and monitored'.

I support this Policy.

Object : c) There are very few traditional materials produced locally.

Agree

I agree

Agree, however point such as "good architecture" could be a matter of personal opinion

Agree

Essential with so many developers grabbing land and destroying a small fishing village

Good architecture is subjective. Like 'good' art it is not the business of one or two self-appointed neighbourhood plan people to say what is 'good' or bad. Probably illegal. Sets bad precedent.

If all the things mentioned in NNP11 were enforced in the future WWHo! would be protected from anymore inappropriate developments which have unfortunately already put a blot on the beautiful landscape

supported

I wish this could have happened earlier, but I am delighted it's been included now.

Agree

as per 11 The problem we have in Ho! is that permission was granted and developments built that are inappropriate and ugly developments of all shapes and sizes. No consideration was given to purpose and place or to what the local community wanted, our "vision" if you like. As a result, the problem we now have is that it will be hard to argue against any particular type of development being built in the future. However, trying to be optimistic, I would urge you to consider purpose and place - purpose perhaps to build permanent, full-time occupied homes to fit local residents needs. These new dwellings should be "protected" if they are social housing therefore retaining rental stock or low-cost housing should tenants/owners want to move on.

At the consultation, we were told that the steering group would like to try and ensure that larger plots are secured. I agree with that and would go so far as to suggest we look back to the old council house principles of being a good sized plot for people to enjoy leisure space or grown their own produce, that the homes have decent sized rooms and be properly/solidly built and that each area has an open space and whatever facilities were deemed necessary given size and purpose of development.

New dwelling in large gardens should not be given permission. This is robbing future generations for a short term profit. People are only a custodian of a house.

Too high buildings at Westward Ho!

Support

This carries on from NNP11 and as stated there the Council must take great care that these ideals are met by any Developer or no development should take place.

I support this policy

Agree

Agree

agree

Very careful consideration

This sounds ideal.

ok

W/Ho! is a complete mismatch of properties. Over the past years new builds have not been compatible with the appearance of adjacent or near by buildings so it will be difficult to prevent further mismatch properties being built. Somehow we must stop this in Westward Ho!. No More high rise flats please!

Pleased that there will be restrictions on how much an existing property or plot can be redeveloped. Happy that there will also be a restriction on the amount of floors new properties will have so that buildings which dwarf existing properties will be stopped.

Hopefully this will stop developers acquiring sizeable plots to mass more dwellings.

Agree

Support.

Research is needed into building to plot ratio for different locations.

Agree with policy. Increase in heights of current building (to include development of current and replacement buildings) should only be allowed if it is not to the detriment of other residents. For example with respect to views and shadowing.

Support

Although more research is needed into building to plot ratio for different locations

B is overly restrictive, eg the new properties near the lifeboat station should not be allowed. D ditto.

I am supportive of this policy

We do not want or need any more second homes or large blocks of apartments

Already part of planning process

Agree particularly (D)

(d) Increase in height should never be permitted for you are changing the character of a rural area which traditionally has no flats

Agree - height again is likely to be a problem if not restricted

Support

Agree

I support clause d) of this Policy for new, redeveloped and replacement buildings.

Object : These policies are too restrictive. Each & every site is different with widely varying characteristics. Where is the evidence to support these proposals?

Agree

I agree

(a) Could rule out extensions which are not detrimental (b) Should allow for replacement dwelling that are the same size

Agree, particularly para 'd'

Agree, particularly comment NNp12 (d)

Concern where a new dwelling is offering flats for single or couple occupation. Again not in the spirit of a neighbourhood plan to make a development cost-prohibitive.

WWHo! has suffered badly in the past with inappropriate developments, blocks of apartments far too high. Please ensure that this stops now! enough is enough.

Important

supported

Brilliant!

Strongly agree

We were told in Ho! that this section was only relevant to Appledore as they have a large percentage of 2nd and holiday homes. This did not go down too well with those present, myself included, as the majority of new development in Ho! in recent years has been 2nd and holiday homes outside of the reach of local people. This has resulted in less housing development sites remaining for local people for affordable homes to be built for them. I strongly urge you to protect Westward Ho! as well as Appledore under the St Ives Principle before we lose even more of our young people who have been priced out of the local market due to low wages, fewer job opportunities and high housing costs.

Agree with the report

Yes - The legal loop hole of small business exemption for such properties should also be tightened up. The holiday homes in Golf Links Road near the Golf club are also occupied all year around (contravening the limited use periods). In Appledore it is difficult to get RNLI crew and Fire Brigade crews to respond quickly to calls due to be unable to afford to buy or rent in the village.

Consider adding Westward Ho! for full-time principal residence condition. It is the opinion of many existing full-time residents that Westward Ho! has reached saturation point with holiday and 2nd homes accommodation.

A difficult area to take a stand on as it needs legislation to be put into effect.

Support

This is a problem all over the West Country and I agree with the Councils proposed plan.

Very important though I fear a case of shutting stable door after the horse has bolted!

I support this policy

It is vital that there is a restriction to the spread of second homes

Agree

Agree

agree

Yes

I agree

This is applied only to Appledore? Is there not a case for it being across the Northam area? Also the policy should not restrict those who let on a long term basis - I hope the wording is clear on this.

this should also apply to Westward Ho! All new developments in and around the village are mainly 2nd homes (all the high rise flats - properties along Golf Links Rd - Wilkes Field (opposite cricket ground) etc. you are talking about hundreds of flats. Whilst properties in W/Ho! are £400k and above it will be people from away buying them up as 2nd homes. No further developments should be built and sold 'designated' as holiday homes.

This should be extended to all dwellings in Northam. Many other areas also have a large proportion of second and holiday homes, i.e. Cross Street in Northam.

Totally approve of principal residency for Appledore to protect the community from becoming full of only holiday homes and second homes. If this were to happen then the local community would die and I feel that then Appledore would lose it's appeal to all year round visitors.

I am in agreement due to locals being priced out of housing and too many second homes but worried about policing of this policy.

Agree but how could this be totally enforced?

Fully support the full-time principal residence housing restriction, however, the infrastructure and amenities will need to be increased (road networks, buses, doctors, dentists etc).

Support.

What the area needs is housing for local people at prices that reflect local wages and income. I agree with a policy of 'occupancy as principal residence'.

Support

An alternative to this is building affordable housing as a requirement for all developers. It should be of equal quality. The new affordable housing in Appledore is of poor quality and design. It is not good enough. Also the proposal is unenforceable and prosecution unaffordable.

I am supportive of this policy

I support this

Disgusting how this has been allowed, no further second homes should be built because they destroy the community

Who owns what and where is not NTC's business

Totally agree

agree

Agree

Support

Agree

I strongly support this Policy. Too many second homes in Appledore are starting to adversely affect the community. And there is a shortage of affordable housing for local people.

Object : The reality is that holiday home and second homes generate a considerable income in Appledore. The policy is too difficult to monitor and enforce. Northam Town Council should encourage dedicated holiday home/ second home site outside of (residential) development boundaries. Where is the evidence to support these proposals?

Agree

I strongly agree

Disagree. This is probably unenforceable. Also a case could be made for having dwellings allowable for second homes rather than existing houses being bought up for this purpose.

Agree but must be monitored

Unenforceable

Total agree

Probably the worst example of over-reach in this plan. Probably illegal. Impinges on the freedom of the individual and demonises the ownership of more than one property. Divisive, politically-motivated and unenforceable. Sadly ill-advised. Object.

We strongly feel that this principle should also apply to Westward Ho! as we already have a high number of holiday homes/apartments. The St Ives principle should apply here too

I don't think that the lower off road parking provision for a 1-2 bed house (ie. a single parking space) is enough. A couple, with or without children, often have two jobs and in this rural community need two cars. Thus, 2 spaces should be required for a 1-2 bed house.

Permission might err in favour of extra off-street parking?

I still think that the provision of parking in new developments fails to take account of the likelihood of multiple vehicles due to both partners working and adult children staying at home. Housing estates are blighted by poor design for parking and you end up with constant jockeying for spaces and no spaces for visitors. I believe that all houses should have off road parking for at least 2 vehicles and flats/apartments should have two spaces allocated. We have to move away from this state led hatred of cars. We live in a rural area where, although there are good public transport, most people need cars to get around. Almost everyone has to commute to work and decent car parking should be planned into all new estates regardless of the potential loss of profit for developers.

We all have to live here and work here, so making appropriate provision for cars makes sense.

Agree

In my opinion any and all new properties whether they be care, residential or commercial should have sufficient provision for their needs given how little parking is available. Local residents are fed up with cars parking over pavements, blocking drives and causing obstructions because of the short-sightedness of local planners who, at one stage, did not include any provision for parking for new developments which was ridiculous.

Parking is important, but if public transport was improved it would reduce the pressure on existing provisions.

Yes - 2nd homes and extra residential properties traffic causes chaos not only during the summer but over the years has increased and now there are queues daily from Heywood Rd Roundabout back to Northam 0800-0900.

There is insufficient car parking space in Westward ho as was seen last summer during a prolonged period of good weather in the school holidays. If you can't find a parking space you give up and go somewhere else. Not good for promoting tourism.

Support

As stated in NNP11 most new developments do not provide enough parking for the number of cars per household, roads are too narrow and with cars stuck all over the place and rubbish bins outside the front doors gives estates the ambience of modern slums.

Provision of electric vehicle charging points is vital and should be demanded on all new developments. I support this policy

Good

Agree

Agree

agree

Very important

I quite agree with this aim.

See my response to NNP11

Any new care or nursing homes should provide adequate parking for staff and visitors on site. (not having to park on our busy narrow roads contributing to road hazards.

I am encouraged that parking provision will be applied to new developments. Parking is an issue for local people and as local businesses thrive, which is good, parking can be difficult at times.

Parking is always a problem due to settlements not being built originally to take cars. There are always more cars per dwelling that can be fitted in and developers always think that they can get away with providing a minimum of parking spaces which is never enough.

Please protect the car parks in Appledore especially, Not all of them are council owned.

Agree in principle

I do not believe the current proposals are sufficient. increasing the number of off road parking spaces per dwelling must be considered to avoid having more vehicles parked on the roads which cause delays and hazards, particularly to emergency vehicles which can result in life threatening delays.

Support.

Electric charging points need to be installed in car parks as well as in developments. Also, cycle parking. Car-parks in Appledore should be protected from development as not all are council owned.

Agree with policy. The aim should be to have all parking lots that are made out of permeable material. This will help with water management.

Support

Please ensure electric charging points are available in car parks as well as in developments. Also cycle parking should be provided.

Car parks within Appledore should be protected from development as not all are council owned

I am supportive of this policy

Adequate parking should be compulsory for all new houses/shops etc.

It is what it is

Very important. Appledore is a village with little private parking and in summer it gets very busy with lack of parking for residents and visitors

Agree with parking provision but car standings should be grassed - see odun road car park. Any new car park should be grass not tarmac

Agree

Support

Agree

I support this Policy.

Object : a), b) & c) These policies are far too restrictive and do not comply with national highway design guidance. Where is the evidence to support these proposals?

Agree with the addition of the protection of our carparks - Odun Road, The Quay, Torridge Road, Windmill Lane, Bone Hill etc.

I agree

this needs to be thought through more carefully. sometime parking provisions are too small or inaccessible and therefore do not get used.

Agree

: Very important Appledore is a small village with little private parking and in the holiday periods it gets very busy with lack of parking for the residents/visitors

Basically good idea but penalises young families (who could well be our lifeboat personnel, our fireman etc) who have 3 or 4 children, making 4 bed accommodation way out of reach of affordability. Ill thought out.

Apartment/holiday homes need more parking provision for visitors to help ease the madness that local residents face at peak times with visitors blocking drives/pavements etc

a) The provision of dwellings (those with 1, 2 or 3 bedrooms) that meet the needs and affordability of local people will be supported, likewise the provision of bungalows in areas close to shopping facilities or public transport.

b) I do not think you will be able to enforce this.

c) To maintain the rural nature of the area the majority of houses should be 2 storeys or less but could also reflect the height of those that surround them. Within new estates prominent/high buildings should only be allowed if their positioning would not overshadow neighbouring properties, impinge on protected views, or contribute substantially to a detrimental change to the landscape.

supported

Agree absolutely, again.

Agree

Please see previous comments re development. Agree with new dwellings to be of reduced height of 2 storeys maximum as we have way too many flats in HQ!

Building more bungalows is important so older people can downsize. To put more family homes on the market.

Agree

Support

No comments on this.

I support this policy

The size of properties should suit the local needs not Air B&B

Agree

Agree

agree

Low rise

These sound ideal but hardly affordable. What about brownfield sites?

ok

b) dwellings of 5 bedroom - can the plan state that this would only be allowed where it is evidenced that this is needed to provide the main residence of a household with a minimum of fifteen years FULL time residency (CAN WE ADD IN THE WORD 'FULL')

too many unaffordable big EXECUTIVE style homes, not for locals

I think that restricting the amount of bedrooms in further developments will hopefully make property more affordable for local people to purchase and encourage families to continue to live in these communities.

We need more smaller dwellings that are affordable but without taking away our green spaces and rural landscape.

Agree

Support.

NNP 15b may not be enforceable and 15c should depend on location.

Agree with policy.

Support

However, we feel that NNP15b is unenforceable and 15c should be dependent on location

No more bungalows please. Look at Staddon Road. B is unenforceable. Homeworkers need extra space especially if they have children so 3/4/5 bedrooms is not unreasonable

I am supportive of this policy

The problem with most modern houses are that they are too small anyway (ie tiny bedrooms/kitchens etc.) So mention should be made of quality of internal space as well as number of rooms.

Starter homes should be built also more bungalows which are more eye pleasing than high rise apartments

Bigger and more expensive the better if built with care

Agree. (c) definitely max. 2 storey building

(b) dwellings of 5 or more bedrooms should not be allowed as new. There are already enough in the nearby locality.

Bungalows would benefit the ageing population and be preferable to flats with no lifts

Support

Agree

I support this Policy. There is a need for appropriately sized affordable local housing.

Object : a) Bungalows have a significantly greater footprint. Density requirements can be an issue. NTC are not in a position to decide, for example, if a Study, should be counted as a bedroom.

b) This is not a realistic policy. What is a 15-year residency in the area?

c) The design and height of dwellings should be dictated by its setting and location, rather than an arbitrary policy.

Where is the evidence to support these proposals?

Agree.

I agree

Disagree. Too many new dwellings already have 1 or 2 bedrooms. There is a need for family accommodation. Also bungalows are a waste of space, unless the roof space is used. In fact all new buildings should have a useable roof space.

Agree particularly para 'c'

Agree (c) definitely max 2 storey

Absolutely ill thought-out. What about young families with children. 3 or four children need 3 or 4 bedrooms. Sadly de-values the whole exercise in a neighbourhood plan. Very poor idea.

We need more affordable family homes with small gardens for locals not large apartment blocks for second homes. Adopt St Ives principle for Westward Ho!

supported

Agreed, seems flexible enough and practical enough

Agree

WE have what one would consider start up units in Westward Ho! Whilst I appreciate the idea behind the suggestion here, I would point out that we have very little land left and what we do have would be better used for local residential development for local people as if people have nowhere to live, where will the businesses get staff from? A perfect example of this is that NDDH cannot get sufficient nursing staff to work their because there are so few well paid job opportunities for their partners, wages are lower and housing costs are higher.

Business should be encouraged.

Agree - we need more local industry/businesses.

Support

Business is important and should be supported as long as it does not interfere with the landscape.

I support this policy

Agree

Agree

agree

Very Important

Agree

support LOCAL business NOT MacDonalds, Starbucks etc etc

I am pleased that support will be given to local businesses as this will support the infrastructure of the communities and provide employment for many.

Business should be encouraged by using what we have already and encouraging more home based business.

d) remove 'significantly'

Support

e and eB add "within the development boundary".

Agree with policy. Brown-field sites given priority. Conversion of business to residential not supported.

Support

b) and e) - add "within the development boundary."

This is good

I am supportive of this policy

NNP17 Should link in with NNP5 (b) and part of (c) could allow for any tin-shed to be built on a green field site. (d) must also mention noise and disturbance to neighbouring residential properties

More help should be given by the government/council to ensure the rateable amounts keep business owners able to afford to keep trading

Business ventures are a closed book to NTC - do not interfere

Agree

Disagree (b) and (c) and (f)

Unspoilt natural countryside should be totally protected from forms of development.
F - appropriate market price is too flexible

Agree

Support

Agree

I support all clauses of this Policy which is important for the economic viability of our villages. I agree brown-field sites are preferable. Clause a) is important to support the local fishing industry.

Object : These proposals are far too restrictive. a) There are plenty of businesses outside the development boundary that should also be allowed to expand.

b) The reality is that there is very little 'brown-field' land in the area. NTC should seek to identify suitable brown-field land for redevelopment.

Agree.

I agree

Agree

Agree

Agree

Needs to err more on the side of encouraging business. Needs to err less on the side of creating more prohibitive legislation.

Agree

a)+ at end and will not undermine the well being of the resident population.

supported

In that category do the high rise developments in Westward Ho fall? These have obliterated the heart of the town and ruined the landscape and vista of many. Will these be stopped by other policies already mentioned on development?

Also, Tourism is not an essential requirement, though it is a contributor to the local economy. And if that is the only requirement needed for a development, then we can look forward to the whole area being built over. So this proviso seems unworkable: "It cannot reasonably be located outside the Undeveloped Coast, estuary and countryside" - how can something be not located elsewhere? Cafes, restaurants on cliff tops, caravan parks will all have a requirement for a view or some kind of attraction. The location of coast or country is the attraction. This is just a way of justifying an attraction - this needs a better way of controlling such development.

The ongoing development of retail opportunities in Appledore is happening and can provide both employment, income and attraction for tourism; so should continue.

Agree

Preference should be given to supporting local people before encouraging more tourism into the area. We should encourage visitors to enjoy the natural beauty that we have to offer as you are trying to achieve with cycle and pathways.

Too much high rise spoils the look of this area. This is what has happened in Westward Ho!. The latest plans for a hotel in the center of the village is a good example.

Agree - the proposed 'Hotel' in Golf Links Rd Westward Ho should not go ahead - too small, no parking, wrong place. Need to use the Kingsley Hall more for visitors - theatre/films & entertainment.

Could you clarify b) the first bullet point which appears to be a contradiction of the preceding text.

An important consideration. See notes re parking.

Support

Tourism is important to the three settlements and as long as it stays within the proposals in NNP18 will not encroach on the character of the area.

I support this policy

Agree

Agree

agree

EXTREMELY IMPORTANT

I agree with all of these aims

There is no mention of Events here where Northam TC has a say on licensing. Events such as surf competitions etc on the Beach at Westward Ho! or music events should be supported. I also wonder whether there should be a separate section on Westward Ho! Beach indicating clearly policies on Beach usage (dogs, kiteboards etc)

Please make a particular point in the Northam Plan (where appropriate) that Holiday makers do not want to holiday in a resort which is completely built up with the continual build of high rise flats and houses. They do expect green space and other facilities other than the beach. This was evident when W/Ho! residents started their petition to save our park from housing, which is still what some Councillors in Torridge want to do.

Sensibly supporting improvements to tourism, attractions, accommodation and access sensitively and in keeping with the countryside and areas around should be encouraged. This should not be to the detriment of existing businesses and be kept in keeping with the areas around it.

: Only with existing provision.

: Agree

In order to increase tourism we need to stop building on our green fields. There will be no desire for tourists to visit when it is nothing but housing developments and gridlocked roads.

Support.

bB "cannot be reasonably located outside the Undeveloped Coast" needs to be more strongly worded as this leaves it wide open for developers. Maybe - "very strong encouragement will be given to proposals for new or extensions to existing tourist accommodation.....to be within the development boundary unless there are exceptional circumstances".

Replace 'does not detract from' with 'is in keeping with'.

Agree with policy with proviso that B&B accommodation within Appledore in current suitable buildings to be supported. Further development of Visitor Centre on the Burrows to be encouraged - within keeping of the area.

Support

b) "cannot be reasonably located outside the Undeveloped Coast" needs to be more strongly worded as this leaves it wide open for developers. Maybe - "very strong encouragement will be given to proposals for new or extensions to existing tourist accommodation..... to be within the development boundary unless there are exceptional circumstances." Replace "does not detract" with "is in keeping with".
I am supportive of this policy

I think there is enough for children to do in our area, but an ice rink or 10 pinbowling alley would be okay for young adults

The number-size-style of all the posts on Appledore Quay are an off putting disgrace

Agree

Disagree. B - The unspoilt coast coast is rapidly being deminished - There should be no new structures as it is at saturation point already and tourists will be deterred by more development

Agree

Support

To be contained within the development boundary and remain in keeping with the local character.

Agree

I support this Policy (more for attractions than accommodation) provided, as stated, the new developments and facilities add to and enhance the settlements.

Object : Too much focus on 'development within the settlement boundary'. The reality is that there is very little scope within the settlement boundaries.

Agree.

The route of the Bideford, Westward Ho!, Appledore Light Railway in Westward Ho! should be protected, including the line of the branch off to the Gas Works in the Park which becomes visible in the grass when there is dry weather as in 2018 - fun history! The railway history here should be developed as a tourism resource for Westward Ho!...linking up with the proposed pedestrian/ cycle route along the railway route from Bideford. See also railway bridge 'Heritage Asset' above.

I agree

Agree

Agree, particular para 'b'

Agree

Needs to acknowledge the employment opportunities provided by tourism, otherwise apart from the overuse of the word 'environment' this is reasonable.

St Ives principle should also apply to Westward Ho! we already have a very a large quantity of holiday accommodation/second homes without sufficient infrastructure to cope

Good

supported

These are reasonable and important constraints. I do wonder if such an ambition is workable though and as such, the area will be condemned to remain an eyesore for longer.

Agree

AS report

Needs developing with sympathetic buildings of industrial heritage using the dry dock with ships/boats in it. Maritime Museum surrounding it/café, small shops, open public sitting areas to enjoy the views with possibly residential accommodation above.

I fully concur with the report.

Support

Richmond Dock is an important historical site and development as a tourist attraction must be sympathetic with its history and architecture. I believe it can still be used for its purpose?? So maybe seeing a ship being built or overhauled in the dock would be an interesting tourist attraction. Also add to the historic importance of the Village.

I support this policy

Agree

Agree

agree

Tourist attraction

I agree

Ok

get it working!

More emphasis should be made in keeping this as an historic site.

Putting boundaries around future development of this historic sight is encouraging but again should be in keeping with the buildings surrounding this area. It could attract more visitors to the area.

This asset needs to be used in the right way.

I am strongly in favour of developing Richmond Dock as a heritage site

Agree

Support

Agree with policy. Point c to be flexible within reason.

Support

One storey is unduly restrictive. What about temporary accommodation for dry dock workers? It has to be a viable working drydock - eg yacht caudles, sail maker, boat/surf board maker.

I am supportive of this policy

Houses must not be build on it or shops, why spoil a magnificent view!!

The plan is too prescriptive. NTC needs to keep an open mind

Agree. Especially (g) no tourist accommodation or housing on dock site

I fully agree with this, having lived near Richmond Dry Dock when it was working I support this

Again, height is paramount - must not obscure the views of properties on Marine Parade

Support

Agree, but-(a) should include small scale commercial/refreshment facilities as part of the visitor experience and that can contribute to the financial viability of The Dock. (c) One storey development a bit prescriptive? Suggest that two storey may be acceptable if demonstrated that a two storey building essential to appropriate usage. Add (g)-some flatted access for accommodation by proprietors/staff only may be acceptable. (I.e. 'living over the shop'.)

I support this Policy promoting the redevelopment of Richmond Dock as a visitor attraction. I'm not sure about the viability of clause c), but agree with the other clauses. I would also support the use of the dock as an actual working dock particularly for heritage boats.

CASH, and now AMHT, have always advocated for the RD site to be developed as a Maritime Centre with the Dry Dock being used as a working dock, primarily for the repair and maintenance of Heritage ships, but also for local commercial vessels (Oldenburg), with ancillary workshops, and a visitors' Heritage centre.

The emphasis is on RD being a working dock, as this is what the Inspector stated in her statement after the Appeal;

"However, as a working dock the site has the potential to provide a number of jobs and valuable infrastructure to support the regeneration of the maritime economy and sustainable transport in the area". This was also stated by English Heritage (Francis Kelly) in his letter at the Appeal.

This is somewhat different from what has been suggested as primarily a visitor attraction, first line of NNP 19;

"Any redevelopment of the Richmond Dock site (MapB5) as a visitor attraction....".

Also the area required for new buildings, in order for the site to become operational, is probably more than 20%. The requirement for RD to be used as a working dock, as per Steve Beacham, the owner of Sharpness Shipyard, is approximately 30%. This includes the area for a travelling crane alongside the dock. Add to this the ancillary workshops and the visitors' heritage centre, which would be envisaged on the Environment Agency land, and the area will be more than 20%.

Agree.

Commercial reality is that a developer will only outlay the large sum involved in repairing / maintaining the dock if there is a viable return. This requires a mixture of housing, tourism and business use and on a greater percentage of land than 20%. Low density, single storey, high build cost business units will not support such work.

I agree

Agree with (a) to (f). Strongly disagree with (g). Part of Richmond Dock should be used for housing or tourism accommodation otherwise it is not feasible for any other use and will fall into further disrepair and remain derelict.

Agree

Surely it is about time that you gave serious consideration to some type of development i.e. Hotel or suitable housing, because ARA has tried long and very hard to do anything with it and can't come up with a real plan.

Agree especially 'G' no tourist accommodation or housing on the dock site

If this proposal is acknowledged then Richmond Dock will remain derelict for another 35 years. Unfortunately, again, reality is not considered. A much more conciliatory attitude is necessary to reach a solution.

Agree

supported

Retaining employment and avoiding housing development on a site so close to the water and detracting from views from across the river are all key factors. Traffic, especially with the housing development proposals up the road, must remain something which is carefully controlled.

Agree

please do not allow any residential development on this site. It must be protected for future employment use, hopefully shipbuilding.

AS report

Would be good to see another Ship Building Company take it on to provide employment, or similar heavy industry that would not impede on housing in Appledore but would provide high employment in the area.

As above.

Support

The closing of the dockyard was a great disappointment, if it could be taken over by another boat building company Appledore would be happy. Boats have been built here since the middle ages, sailors and ships from Appledore fought in the Armada. To keep the history alive and working would be good for the Village and the County. I hope the Council is working hard to encourage shipbuilding to restart in the yard and not to turn it into another small industry estate or shopping mall. Please think hard on this one.

I support this policy

Agree

Agree

Should find work and keep it open for business

I agree

OK

needs to be used to build ships

Jumping the gun here! It should remain a shipyard of some form.

Keeping the Shipyard site as a place for employment is so important. Local people need employment.

We need employment in Appledore and this site needs to be used

Agree

Support.

Agree that Appledore Shipyard should be kept as an employment site, preferably for building and/or repair of ships or similar.

Support

Extend to cover the Appledore fish dock, recycling lorry store

I am supportive of this policy

This should have a preservation order placed on it so that perhaps it will be used for future shipbuilding

Best left to market forces

I see another major battle. Agree with comments

Endorse this. However the site must be preserved for ship building for future needs.

Agree

Support

Agree

I support this Policy, as it is important to retain quality employment opportunities in the area.

Object : This policy is far too restrictive. Policies must be more open minded to different types of development. This site could end up like the Old Creamery site in Torrington – derelict for over 20 years. For example, what if Centre Park wished to develop the site – a potentially great development, with employment and income generation in the whole area.
It must be maintained for commercial ship building use to provide employment in Appledore and Torridge

I agree

Agree, but emphasis must be put on it remaining to be used for shipbuilding or repair.

Agree

I can see yet another major battle. Agree with comments

Excellent to ensure the shipyard continues. Again setting pre-conceived conditions on highway or use of materials is contra to encouraging employment. Remember the shipyard was there before many of the neighbouring properties and more essential.

Agree