

BANTHAM SITE

- **Bantham** is definitely the best site on offer, and community led housing Bantham will improve the social mix. The houses will also fit in with the current building line, also redresses the balance between permanent residents and second homes.
- Of the two remaining options, the West Buckland site has major complications with road access combined with topographical challenges due to the steepness of the land. I consider it would be unviable and too expensive to go ahead with. The **Bantham** site on offer fits in with existing housing, minimum intrusion visually due to good landscaping unlike some of the new private expansion of the existing housing. It would add to the village feel, with working people and children taking part in real village activities, Bantham Life Saving Club etc, while growing up, working in the shop, pub and offering local services. In other words help put back the heart in the village.... a prompt application is crucial with no more stalling ... and a more embracing thought process taking over for the benefit of the whole community. My vote is for the Bantham site and a fast outcome please.
- **Bantham** site is a natural extension of the village. Near the shop, pub and beach/river access.
- The site in West Buckland will not be suitable for 6 such houses unless it can be moved further along the lane between Grove Cottage and the Thurlestone-WB road. Even if the site move could be made with the landowner's agreement, the land at **Bantham** is in a much better position with easy access to shop, pub, beach and so would better achieve the Neighbourhood Plan's aims.
- We need a full presentation of all the proposed sites. Don't forget the song – "take paradise and put up a parking lot." Having said that I'm in favour of housing for locals 100% in and around **Bantham**.
- The West Buckland option seems illogical and ill thought out – terrain, levels, drainage, access. All poor. **Bantham** is a good position and will be (generally) welcomed by the community other than the NIMBY's who don't care where the housing is as long as its out of their sight. Well done!
- The site in **Bantham** will be ideal for young families, close to the shop and beach and within walking distance of the school and bus. Having lived in the parish for over 60 years, we need young people back living here. We did not get the chance to buy but were lucky to get a house to rent 40+ years ago. I don't think it will spoil any views from the road because it will hardly be seen.
- Community led housing needs to be our first priority. For a healthy community we need a full demographic mix. Without that, communities wither. What could be nicer for **Bantham** than to have young families? Children running barefoot to the beach, growing up in the bosom of a small village. We would feel so proud that the first thing visitors see of our village as they drive down the road is community led housing. I would be in favour of both sites. With the housing crisis and now coronavirus, we must make sure young families are helped towards an optimistic future.

- Whilst just one house, Langman's Quarry, was being renovated the lanes between West Buckland and Thurlestone were frequently blocked, delaying otherwise short journeys. The West Buckland site is totally impractical as a site! The shop in **Bantham** is a vital part of our community, with extra parking it will continue to thrive.
- The access along the bottom lane past Grove Cottages is very narrow and down the hill, past Woodlands and Peter's Field impassable to anything bigger than a car. West Buckland is therefore an impossibility as a choice. **Bantham** favoured.
- If North Upton is definitely off the table as it is not a community, then **Bantham** is the obvious site – a shop, pub and ready-made community.
- If **Bantham** is to be the site then the houses should be in keeping with the surroundings. I hope they will look like barn conversions with stone walls and wooden cladding and not like the houses on the new estate at Churchstow. They should enhance the village! Severe restrictions should be put on building vans and deliveries to avoid congestion during construction. Access potentially through the fields at the top of Bantham Road rather than down at the junction area (near the Sloop).
- It's a no brainer, the Buckland site has poor to no access. The costs to create an access would be huge. The **Bantham** site is perfect, has great access and would be well connected to an existing community including shop and pub. The real community engagement should come in the design as this will be what we see forever, the design needs to be right – turf roofs, eco houses fit for the future!
- We feel that the proposed housing at West Buckland would be less appropriate because of its location. The proposed site at **Bantham** would provide close proximity to the shop, pub and the beach without undertaking lengthy walk on our busy lanes.
- The **Bantham** site is a more suitable location for community led housing as it is closer to local amenities such as the pub, Bantham village stores and the beach. The site sits well within the current village boundary and will readily be part of the Bantham community. The West Buckland site is isolated from the Buckland community and there are no amenities close by for future residents of such a scheme.
- The purpose of community led housing is to enable and encourage families with a connection to the parish to live here but who are not able to afford the high market prices which properties in the parish can command. The **Bantham** site close to the shop, the Sloop and the beaches must be the preferred choice of the families who are likely to make use of the scheme. The Buckland site tucked away at the back of the village with none of the facilities of the Bantham site, served by a very narrow lane and in shadow most of the day sends out all the wrong messages and will self-evidently be extremely expensive to excavate. Conversely, the Bantham site is comparatively flat and presumably can as a collateral advantage contribute towards the badly needed car parking for the shop.
- The **Bantham** site is more appropriate and sustainable. Residents would have the shop, the pub and the beach within a short flat walk. The Buckland

site has no services close to it and is at the bottom of the valley in a poor location and would be expensive to build.

- I think a family would prefer to be close to the local shop, pub and beach and therefore I support the **Bantham** site as the best location for a community housing scheme.
- I think people would prefer to live closer to the shop, the pub, and the beach. That is why I support the **Bantham** site.
- We live in **Bantham** and fully support this site.
- **Bantham** site is favoured. We remain totally supportive of the Community Led Housing but are becoming increasingly concerned with regard the direction this essential scheme is going. The current Village Voice reinforces our apprehension. With regard the two current sites, the Bantham one, which has been our preferred site since it became available, has the advantage of being an extension of the village, as was the previous Buckland site, which we also supported. In addition the Bantham site would also be a substantially cheaper development proposition and would benefit from the amenities in the village. Even taking into account that we live in Buckland, desperation now appears to be evident. It is hoped that common sense will prevail and the high cost of environmental, topographical, ecological and highway surveys will not be undertaken as it is patently obvious that this site (West Buckland) is totally inappropriate
- **Bantham** site is favoured. I would love the community housing to be in West Buckland but I don't think the West Buckland site is viable: (1) terrible access – very narrow lanes (2) the cost of digging into that sheer hillface! The Bantham site would adjoin existing housing, be a great location for families and bring much needed life to our communities.
- I think the site in **Bantham** would be more suited to new local housing. The access is much easier, it is on the secondary school bus route, close to amenities and would be part of the village. The Buckland site doesn't have very good road access, and the houses wouldn't feel part of the community, as they are removed from the main village. Sound also echoes/reverberates from the bottom of the valley too. At the site in Bantham, would there also be the opportunity to create more parking for the village shop at the same time?
- We believe the **Bantham** site is more suitable. There are more facilities – shop, pub and beach etc. plus better access roads. Bantham is far more “alive” for young families whereas West Buckland is largely a “retirement” hamlet.
- **Bantham** because it is flat, so less expensive to develop, near an existing settlement, near to utilities such as electricity and drainage (although the existing drainage/sewage system does need to be improved), carries on the line of existing housing from ‘The Watch’, near to a shop, pub and the beach and about 15 min walk to school. Also just off the main Bantham road, so easy access.
- **Bantham** site is favoured. The site opposite the shop is the perfect location for the community housing project. Bantham is the place with the fewest full time residents, so is in desperate need of additional population. This will

boost the economy of Bantham, providing more business for the shop, pub and beach-based businesses. Having young families living here will also help the local school. People who contribute, or want to come back to contribute to our community, should be allowed to live in the heart of the village, not to mention the extra parking it will provide for the shop which will ensure its survival.

- The proposed **Bantham** site is right next to The Watch where I have lived for the past 40+ years. It is the ideal site. It's not stuck out on its own, it would not be an eyesore. The only properties looking over it have wonderful views in the opposite direction... It may be viewed from the road down but should mostly be out of view because of high hedges. A few extra residents' cars will not make any difference against the hundreds coming to the beach everyday. My siblings and our children have had the best start in life growing up here and my children would love to have stayed. Two of them do still live in the parish, both working locally and one has applied/requested to have a community house. My daughter has applied also. Both of them fitting the criteria set down – she moved away to further her NHS career but would now like her family to have the healthy Devon lifestyle and bring her work skills here. Having grown up here and having family here she is also eligible. We urgently need community housing to bring young life back to the village. YES, YES, YES to the Bantham site.
- **Bantham** is our site of preference for the community led housing. The name community led housing implies that it should ideally be situated in the heart of the community. We were led to believe that the whole notion of the Neighbourhood Plan was to support sustainability therefore the housing should be built close to the shop and pub to provide them with new and sustained custom. There is also a need to increase the full time population of Bantham in order for a sustainable community to be built so that young families can support each other and new residents can support existing elderly residents. Currently, Bantham is virtually a ghost town during the off-season and it would be desirable to start to build a year round community in this location. ... The café also acts as a community hub ... and it would be a sorely missed community resource if it were to close due to lack of business therefore any opportunity to support trade should not be overlooked. If car parking for the shop could be included in the new development, this would also be extremely beneficial. I do not buy the point made in the letter of opposition written in the Village Voice that new housing in this location would somehow spoil the 'first glimpse of Bantham.' This comes from the assumption that the community led housing would be an eyesore, but what happens if it is attractive, sympathetic and enhances the gateway to the village? The true beauty of the village doesn't really begin till Street Cottage on the left down to the fisherman's cottages. All the estate cottages have traditionally been the homes of the people who lived and worked in the village, so we feel quite strongly that this tradition should be continued in this location with the community led housing project. This land is the flatter of the two sites on offer and if you want to attract families, usable gardens which are not terraced into a steep slope ... are far more desirable. The

relative flat ness also means that there would be less objections about the new housing overlooking existing housing or being a blot on the landscape .. By contrast (in parenthesis) the West Buckland site is a valuable wildlife resource and heritage asset. Bantham is a far more accessible site and would not involve the immense costs of excavating rock and disposing of the spoil that would be presented by the Buckland site.

- As long as they are built it doesn't really matter, but we think there is more to **Bantham** for the people who might live there.
- It is important that this project is completed asap to end the waiting families to have a home and not to be intimidated by the vociferous minority in Bantham! **Bantham** site favoured.
- We favour the **Bantham** site. We feel that this is the best site to accommodate younger families as they would be joining a younger, more active community. Also, growing the population of Bantham will help maintain the local businesses (shop and pub) which we feel is vital for their long term sustainability. The site opposite the shop also appears suitable as it simply extends an existing row of houses.
- I don't believe the West Buckland site "maintains the vitality of a village community" as well as the **Bantham** site would where they have access to local businesses. I don't think any development at Bantham would compromise the view of that part of the community as the housing there is not particularly attractive or of note as it stands and there is an assumption that any new housing would be unattractive. I don't believe the road at West Buckland will tolerate not only the construction traffic but the 6 fold traffic to be expected once occupied.....That part of West Buckland is a heritage site and is particularly tranquil and special, this will be destroyed. The proposed plot at Bantham does not have that history or tranquillity to be compromised. The wildlife in the field site at West Buckland is prevalent and frequent, from deer, foxes, rabbits, barn owls and pheasants.
- Being permanent residents in West Buckland, having been to see both sites, understanding the topography, we do not feel that West Buckland site is a viable option for Community Housing. We support the **Bantham** site for its access. The West Buckland site has terrible access and would impact greatly on the narrow lanes surrounding it.
- We live in West Buckland and fully supported the first scheme to build affordable housing in the field opposite the Chapel/Barns. It would be wonderful to bring new life to West Buckland but the new site offered seems quite impractical and expensive to convert into a building site. We are sure there will be other planning and highways considerations which make the **Bantham** site in every way preferable.
- Has access to the whole village along the lane been considered for improvement/widening/passing places? Needs to be, particularly when building is in progress. **Bantham** site favoured.
- Opposite the village shop is a good place for housing. **Bantham** site favoured.
- **Bantham** site favoured. More natural light, plus near a shop and better road.
- **Bantham** site is a better location as it is more central in the village. West Buckland is on a very steep hill which makes the build much more difficult

and costly. The site is also damp and I would worry about the damp etc. Really support the project as it is extremely important to have this as part of our community.

- Either location would be OK for affordable homes. **Bantham** site favoured.
- **Bantham** favoured. Development will be near the village shop. Traffic will use road from Churchstow, thus avoiding roads to Thurlestone.
- On such a steep incline, it would be totally impractical to build on the West Buckland site and have additional traffic on an extremely narrow lane. **Bantham** site favoured.
- I think finding a suitable site is almost impossible when the entire parish lies within the AONB. But not providing affordable housing is not an option if we want to have a sustainable community. Therefore, I think building on the edge of **Bantham** is the best solution. As here it will have minimum impact, but maximum effect, putting year-round life back into the village.
- There is no chance of the West Buckland site getting planning permission so don't waste time pursuing it. **Bantham** is the one – go for it, for the sake of families wanting houses.
- We live in Thurlestone so are unaware of the issues within Bantham and West Buckland but feel quite strongly that community led housing should be built where is some infrastructure and amenities for the new residents. **Bantham** has a shop and pub, West Buckland is more 'out in the sticks.'
- The site at **Bantham** is much nicer, more sun in winter, near village amenities. The West Buckland site will not get winter sun until late in the day. If left, the Bantham site will be built on, probably by a 2nd home despite the area plan.
- **Bantham** site favoured. The West Buckland site option is one of the more ludicrous planning suggestions that I've encountered in my 25 years of building houses. You are proposing heavy plant, tens of tradesmen and a continuous stream of deliveries to drive past Thurlestone Primary School each day and into W Buckland? It would absolutely paralyse the lane from Thurlestone into our village, one that can, even now, become overwhelmed with traffic. Pedestrians – and there are a lot of them – would be placed in serious danger. The site itself is wholly inappropriate, and access would become a nightmare, and create utter chaos. At the foot of a steep hill, major earthworks would be required and the water run-off diverted by the proposed scheme would add to the flooding that we already have to deal with. There are so many flat fields that border the main Bantham road that would be suitable. Why on earth are these not being considered?
- **Bantham** site favoured. The advantages of the Bantham site include: the land is easily accessible from Bantham lane; the site would not require extensive levelling, it benefits from 2 nearby facilities – a shop and a pub, there is a site plan to show the layout and photos showing a view from the Bantham lane of where the site is; although not in the centre of Bantham, it is nearer the facilities than the site at West Buckland which is in a particularly secluded part of West Buckland. The disadvantages of West Buckland site include: a 30/40 foot bank to negotiate in order to gain access; how would cars gain access and how would adequate parking spaces for 6 dwellings be provided?;

the land would require expensive and extensive evacuation and levelling, the access lane is narrow and in bad weather could be impassable – in all directions it requires negotiating steep gradients; although nearer the village school in Thurlestone, it requires travel (either on foot or by car) up and down a steep and narrow lane with inadequate passing places; West Buckland's only facility is a 'phone box'. If I had a young family, Thurlestone would be far the most convenient of the 3 settlements in Thurlestone parish to live in. As a result of the far greater facilities in Thurlestone it should be considered as a place for community housing..... Although no site is on offer at the moment, it is not clear whether a site could be found. The idea that it is the turn of either Bantham or West Buckland to provide community led housing may have been the reason for not considering having the housing in Thurlestone.

- **Bantham** is best from a planning perspective. I think overall this seems the better location for all involved.
- To be honest we don't think either sites are ideal due to road access/traffic, especially in the summer months. However, if it's a choice of these two sites we believe **Bantham** is preferable as it would be part of a community – near shop, beach, pub etc. At least some activities could be achieved without the use of a car. All within walking distance.
- **Bantham** site favoured. (In parenthesis) the West Buckland site is an area of unspoilt natural habitat; any development would need to be extensive and would cause long term damage to this environment – the vehicular access would be difficult and the housing would stick out like a sore thumb; pedestrian access is poor; taking into account the difficult access and rocky terrain, this site will not be financially viable; according to the SHDC specialist, the site does not comply with the neighbourhood plan and JLP.
- The **Bantham** site is the only option, I don't see any reason why this site would be a problem. The West Buckland site would be difficult access for materials and machinery and it is too steep. It has everything needed, near the shop and school. ... It would hopefully keep the younger generation in the parish, like my son and family who were born here and may have to look outside the parish when we have to give up the farm.
- **Bantham** seems sensible as the Buckland site is tucked away down steep and narrow lanes on an incline, not good for families and walking. Whereas the village site is on the fringe of a built up area – level – near local facilities and family friendly! Seems obvious choice?

There were an additional 28 leaflets favouring the **Bantham** site (without comment)

WEST BUCKLAND SITE

- Too much traffic in Bantham as it is without more housing. It's a nightmare most of the time trying to get in and out of our properties. **Buckland** is a much better proposal. Very quiet and easy access. Bantham fields should be left for crops and animals not housing.
- Neither site is suitable, but if we have to choose then **West Buckland** is more favourable than Bantham. The Bantham road suffers enormous congestion at peak times already. Adding construction traffic from the roundabout to Bantham village is an ill conceived idea, that will add to the existing chaos. A new site with easy access for large vehicles needs to be found.
- **West Buckland** site favoured. This seems like a 'done deal'. The option gives no information on which I base an opinion, but as I have no interest in either this is from my perspective. West Buckland: nearer to school, transport, church, PO and shop, village hall and 1+ beach. Bantham: Further to walk to school transport etc. Nearer to cafe and beach. Both sites within walking distance of 2 pubs. The Bantham site is depicted N.T. Scale which leaves a huge chunk of land at rear of proposed site. Site would be unsuitable to allow cars (12 spaces + 2) to come onto Bantham Lane which can be somewhat fast at times and coastguard cottages drive out onto West Buckland road (slightly slower than BL).
- **West Buckland** site favoured. A good addition to West Buckland hamlet.
- **West Buckland** site favoured. Several sites other than the ones in Bantham have been suggested, all turned down. Did those turned down go before the planning group at SHDC or did one person decide they would not pass the requirements. As I understand it the cost to build in Bantham will be considerably more than other sites especially when it comes to dealing with sewers. If SHDC continue to overrule the Parish Council why do we have a Parish Council and was the Neighbourhood Plan a waste of all the time and money Government put into it.....
- Housing build opposite the Bantham shop will be a blight on the landscape. **West Buckland** site favoured.
- We are not sure that either site is suitable but the West Buckland site is not visually intrusive like the Bantham site. We do need to find a site for community led housing and reduce the number of largely vacant second homes. Favoured **West Buckland** site.

There were 5 leaflets favouring West Buckland (without comments).

NEITHER SITE

- **Neither site** is appropriate for such a development. We will object to both.
- We are two people in this household and we both feel that **neither site** is appropriate. Two votes strongly against both sites.

- **Neither site** is appropriate. The West Buckland site is very steep and would be far too costly to develop for six houses, the Bantham site is also not desirable as the owner of the Bantham site is no philanthropist and is only offering this site in order to open up the footprint to develop more lucrative sites in Bantham for the Estate to develop and cash in on by manipulating the Neighbourhood Plan. It is extremely disturbing to know that this leaflet was distributed in Village Voice as it opens up the possibility of people from outside the parish to complete and I understand this has happened. The obvious area for sensible consideration is somewhere in the village of Thurlestone where there is a school, village shop, bus services and a larger permanent community all year round. It is not acceptable to say no land is available as it can be “acquired” if necessary.
- **Neither site** is suitable. Bantham: (1) This land is protected to avoid any development – regardless of proposed end use. (2) Access directly onto the Bantham land will cause congestion – it is at the same point where traffic already stops for the shop, and will further impede access for emergency vehicles – ambulance/fire engines etc – further endangering existing residents’ access to these emergency services. (3) On the busiest of local lanes this is not suitable for young families. (4) Visual impact – there is no debate that development here will have a massive impact on the village totally changing its character and feel forever – the very reason tourists come and the mainstay of our local economy. (5) The challenges to remove any damaging visual impact of a development of this size in such a small village are huge and to minimise that will be exorbitantly expensive. This added to the cost of development will impact the affordability of these houses. Buckland: Not enough information has been provided on this site – but based on the limited information we have we can surmise this is another very expensive option. General comments: We believe Community Housing is a great idea but not in either of the site options suggested. The PC and community should work together to find the right location including revisiting past sites rejected by the council to find an affordable option. Also the alternative site suggested beside the allotments in Bantham would be far more suitable and we should try and encourage the landowner to reconsider as this would get far less objection and have been told would be preferred by AONB. There is resistance from the PC to discuss the fact that as yet the right site has not been found. Under no circumstances can any development be justified because it is the only site currently on the table or out of desperation to meet a false deadline. We are privileged to have insight that government funding is highly likely to be extended due to the impact of Covid-19. We should thank the landowners but confirm the sites are not supported by the community and that we continue to look for the right site.
- **Neither** of these options are suitable. There is no public transport available to either and an access in both cases is via single lane overused roads. If this housing is to be genuinely ‘affordable’ ie catering to first time buyers of limited means, then there must be available and practical public transport.
- **Neither site.** We are unhappy with the loaded question. There should have been a box with none of the above.

- **Neither site** is suitable, in our opinion. The site in West Buckland is so unsuitable one can only think it was chosen as a 'red herring'. We agree wholeheartedly with all that was published in the last edition of the Village Voice in the letter titled Community Led Housing. Please continue to look for a more suitable site that isn't in such a prominent position in Bantham and a blot on the landscape.
- **Neither site.** The W Buckland site, a ridiculous notion. Poor access. Wildlife habitats (trees). The Bantham site, destruction of a green field site, would completely change the face of Bantham, a village that needs to be protected from development. Outside village boundary. Lovely to live near the sea but no amenities for children. Poor access. We do have a small community in Bantham.
- **Neither site.** The Bantham area is an Area of Outstanding Beauty. If a new cluster of houses were built at the entrance to the village – the village would lose its unique charm. The one road to, and through the village, struggles enough with the volume of traffic; more houses = more cars. The basic infrastructure of the village cannot take more dwellings. It would ruin the area. I don't think new houses should be built in either site. It's too small – and summer traffic is too heavy already. Removing another green field for houses is unnecessary – there are other places. Neither site is appropriate.

There was 1 leaflet not favouring either site (without comment).