

Q1a Which one of the following best describes the capacity in which you are completing this questionnaire?	Q1b Other text	Q1c If you're completing this questionnaire as an official representative of an organisation, please tell us the name of your organisation:	Q2 On average over the last 12 months, how often have you visited or used the Port Royal Sidmouth?	Q3:1 I use the car parks in the area	Q3:2 I am a member of Sidmouth Sailing Club, Sidmouth Gig Club, Sidmouth Angling Club or other watersports club that has facilities in the area.	Q3:3 I am a Sidmouth Lifeboat volunteer	Q3:4 I use Sidmouth Leisure Centre	Q3:5 I use The Ham green open space, and / or The Ham play area	Q3:6 I use the area for launching my boat or other watersports equipment	Q3:7a Other text	Q4 How much do you agree or disagree with the development being up to 5 storeys high to allow the improvements to facilities to happen?
1			4	1	0	0	0	0	0		4
1			1	0	0	0	0	0	0	Regular walking route	2
1			1	1	0	0	1	1	0		5
1			2	1	1	0	0	0	0		2
1			2	1	1	0	0	1	0		2
1			2	1	0	0	0	0	0	Regular walking route	4
1			3	1	0	0	0	1	0		4
1			2	0	0	0	0	0	0	To keep an eye on the cliff falls.	4
1			1	0	0	0	0	0	0	Regular walking route	5
1			2	1	0	0	0	0	0		2

1		2	1	0	0	0	1	0		5
1		1	0	0	0	0	1	0	Regular walking route	5
5	(Deleted DPA)	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	Consideration of Sidmouth BMP	2
3		1	1	1	0	0	0	0	I always cycle to Port Royal to admire the coast, look at sea etc. before going to work in town.	2
1		1	0	1	0	0	0	0		2
1		2	1	1	0	0	0	0		5
1		1	0	0	0	1	1	0	Regular walking route	5
1		2	1	0	0	0	1	0		1
1		1	0	0	1	1	0	0		2
1		2	1	0	0	1	1	0	Toilets and seating.	5
1		1	0	0	0	0	1	0		2
1		1	1	0	0	0	1	0	Regular walking route	5
1		2	0	0	0	0	0	0	Regular walking route	5
1		3	0	0	0	0	0	0	Regular walking route and viewing the cliffs.	5
4	(Deleted DPA)	1	1	1	0	0	1	0		2
1		1	1	0	1	0	0	0	Regular walking route	5
1		1	0	0	0	1	1	0		5
1		2	0	0	0	1	0	0	Regular walking route	5
1		1	1	0	0	1	1	0	Regular walking route	5
1		2	0	0	0	0	1	0		3

1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Walking and cycling through.	5
1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0		5
2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Regular walking route	5
1	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	Visit fish shop.	4
1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1			5
1	2	0	1	0	0	0	1			5
5	(Deleted DPA)	1	1	1	0	1	0	0		3
1	(Deleted DPA)	1	0	0	0	1	0	0		5
5	(Deleted DPA)	1	0	0	1	0	0	0		2
1		2	0	0	0	0	0	0	Walking, general views of Sidmouth	5
1		2	0	0	0	0	0	0	Jog / walk to Esplanade	5
1		2	0	0	0	0	1	0	Dog walking along Esplanade	4
1		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	To buy fresh fish an dog walking.	2
1		1	1	1	0	0	1	0	I check cliff falls at Pennington Point.	3
1		2	1	0	0	1	1	0	Walking and cycling through.	5
1	(Deleted DPA)	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	Walking and cycling through.	5
5	(Deleted DPA)	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	To look at the cliffs / view.	1
1		1	1	1	0	0	1	1	Walking	5
1		1	0	1	0	0	0	0	(Deleted DPA)	5
1		2	1	0	0	0	1	0		2
1		2	0	1	0	0	1	1	Jumping off the jetty.	5

1		2	1	0	0	0	1	1		2
	(Deleted DPA)									
4		1	1	0	0	1	1	0	(Deleted DPA)	4
1		1	0	1	0	1	1	0	Regular walking route	5
1		2	1	0	0	1	1	0	Seafront use	1
3		2	1	0	0	0	0	0		2
1		2	0	0	0	0	0	0		1
1		1	0	0	0	0	1	0		1
1		1	0	0	0	0	1	0	Admiring the view from the seafront.	5
									For fitness, walking and convenient cut through to watch cliff falls.	
1		1	0	0	0	0	1	0		5
1		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	Walking	2
1		2	1	0	0	0	0	0	Walking	3
1		2	0	0	0	0	0	0	Walking	4
1		1	0	0	1	0	1	0	Access to the town and Sidmouth facilities	5
1		2	1	0	0	0	1	0		2
									Looking at the sea and taking in the sea air. I often cycle into town and PR is a good place to stop.	
1		2	0	0	0	0	0	0		4
1		2	1	1	0	1	0	0	Walking	2
1		1	0	0	0	1	0	0		5
1		2	1	0	0	0	1	0	To purchase fish.	5
1		1	1	0	0	1	1	0	Daily walks. Shopping at fish shop. Painting.	5
1		1	1	0	0	1	1	1		5

1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1		5
								Walking along the seafront. Using the toilets.	
1	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	Buying fish.	5
								Walking my dogs along the promenade and using the toilets.	
2	2	1	0	0	1	1	0		5
1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0		5
1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	Part of my daily walk.	5
1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0		5
1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	To enjoy the scenery.	5
1	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	Toilets.	5
1	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	Promenade walking. Interesting scenery.	2
1	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	Seafront walks and to visit the TIC.	2
1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0		5
3	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	(Deleted DPA)	5
1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1		5
								Admire the view and look at the boats.	
1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	Parking. Toilets.	3
1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0		5
2	5	0	0	0	0	1	0		2
2	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	also the public toilets.	3
								Walking and to see how bad the cliff has become!	
1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0		5
2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	Regular visitors	2
2	3	1	1	0	0	0	0		3

1	2	1	1	0	0	1	1		5
3	4	0	0	0	0	1	0		5
1	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	(Deleted DPA)	4
(Deleted DPA)									
5									
(Deleted DPA)									
5	1	1	0	1	0	0	0		2
1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0		3
1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0		3
1	2	1	0	1	0	0	0		2
1	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	walking	5
1	5	1	0	0	1	0	0		1
1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0		5
2	2	1	0	0	0	1	0		2
3	1	1	0	0	0	1	0		5
1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0		5
								I visit the Port Royal area a number of times a week as part of my walk along the sea front	
1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	or enter	3
1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	Walk the dog	5
1	2	1	1	0	0	1	0		1
2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	Sidmouth Folk week	5
1	2	0	1	0	1	1	0		2
								General recreation including using The Ham, The Esplanade and Alma Bridge	
1	2	0	0	0	0	1	0		5

1		2	1	1	0	1	0	0		5
1		3	1	0	0	0	0	0		1
1		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	Access to esplanade and enjoyment of the open space of The Ham.	5
1		2	1	0	0	1	1	0	I visit the lifeboat with my son and walk along the promenade	5
1		2	1	0	0	1	1	0		1
5	East Devon resident	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	Shop at wet fish shop	5
1		2	1	0	0	0	1	0		5
2		2	1	0	0	1	1	0		5
1		2							Walk through the area on a regular basis.	5
1		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	Area include in a daily walk routine.	1
1		2	1	0	0	1	1	0	To look at the sea and cliffs	1
3		1	1	0	0	1	1	0	Regular Walking in the area.	5
2		4	0	0	0	0	0	0	Visiting Lifeboat Station and mouth of river, buying fish, recreational	5
1		2	1	0	0	0	1	0	I walk within the area on a weekly basis	5
1		2	1	0	0	0	1	0		5
1		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	I walk through the Ham and pause at Port Royal to savour the view every day	5
1		1	1	0	0	0	0	0		5
2		5	0	0	0	0	1	0		2

3	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	Enjoying walking through the area probably four times plus a week	4
1	2	0	1	0	0	0	1		5
1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	I regularly walk circuits which take me through Port Royal. I call at Port Royal whenever in town.	5
3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0		5
1	2	1	0	0	0	1	0		1
1	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	Walking dog on beach	5
1	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	I am a customer of the fish shop. And use the beach area	2
1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0		5
1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	(Deleted DPA)	5
1	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	enjoyment of walking all along esplanade	4
1	2	1	0	0	1	1	0		5
1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	It is wonderful to be able to walk to the sea front, enjoying the view of the seafront, Ham etc.	5
1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0		5
2	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	(Deleted DPA)	5
2	4	1	0	0	1	1	0		1
1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	Walking through to the seafront	4
0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	(Deleted DPA)	5
1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	I walk the coast path	5
1	2	1	1	0	0	1	1		5

1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	I have lunch break there	5
1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	Enjoying the scenery and the view of the cliffs and walking in the area.	5
1	2	1	0	0	1	1	0		5
1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	I walk to the sea front everyday and I am a regular customer at Sidmouth Trawlers Fish Shop	5
1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0		4
1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0		4
1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0		5
1	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	I walk through the area on my way to the beach from home and vice versa.	5
1	2	1	0	0	0	1	0		2
1	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	General recreation on The Ham and at Port Royal.	5
1	1							I buy fish and look at the sea and crumbling cliffs	5
1	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	Every time we are in Sidmouth we buy fish from the wet Fish Shop & walk through the area to the Byes	5
2	4	1	0	0	0	1	0		5
1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	Recreational purposes	5
1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	I visit daily as part of a leisure walk or bike ride	5
1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	walking, visiting Lifeboat house and pool; access to beach	5

1		2	1	1	0	1	0	0	I visit Sidmouth Trawlers to buy fresh fish	5
1		2	1	0	0	0	0	0	walking, relaxing, exercising dog on beach	5
1		2	1	0	0	1	1	0	I visit the lifeboat, tourist office, toilets and swim, walk round the area for the exercise and views.	5
1		2	1	0	0	1	1	0		2
1		2	1	0	0	1	0	0		4
1		2	1	0	0	1	0	0		4
1		4	0	0	0	1	1	0	Walking	5
1		1	0	0	0	1	0	0	(Deleted DPA)	5
1		2	1	0	0	1	0	0	OCCASIONAL USE OF TOILET FACILITIES	5
1		1	0	0	0	0	1	0		5
1		1	1	0	0	0	0	0	(Deleted DPA)	5
1		2	0	0	0	0	0	0	To buy fish	4
1		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	(Deleted DPA)	5
1		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	I cycle the seafront each morning.	5
1		2	1	1	0	1	1	0		5
1		2	0	0	0	0	1	0		5
1		1	0	0	0	0	1	0		5
4	(Deleted DPA)	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	Recreational visits	5
1		2	0	0	0	0	1	0	Walking, to access Cliff rad area, and the coastal path.	5
1		2	0	0	0	0	0	0	I daily walk the seafront	2

1	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	I walk through the area on my way to and from the seafront (this is my most frequent use)	5
1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	to look out to sea and check on the rock fall. to observe the fishing boats on Sunday morning.	4
2	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	walk the promenade/use the toilets/regularly picnic in the covered seating area next to the toilets	5
1	2							look at the sea. check on the cliff falls . look at the fishing boats on a Sunday . pick up litter.	4
1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	I use the fish shop	4
1	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	Visit Sensory Garden, River Walk, Sidmouth Trawlers. Also sit in the shelter at the turning circle.	5
1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	Walking & leisure	5
1	2	1	0	0	1	1	0		5
1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0		5
1	2	1	0	0	1	1	1	Visiting Sid mouth Trawlers fish shop	5
1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	I walk through The Byes from my home to the seafront via Port Royal 2 or 3 times a week.	5
1	2							Walking along the esplanade and we use Tourist Info. Centre and Public Toilets/ footpaths	5
1	2	1	1	0	1	1	0	Chilling out, cycling through and along the front and I often use the public toilets	5

1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1		5
								For pleasure to walk our dog and enjoy the area as it is. I also use the fishmongers and the toilets	
1	2	1	0	0	1	1	1		5
								Walking, looking at the sea and cliffs, relaxing etc.	
1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0		5
1	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	(Deleted DPA)	5
2	3	0	0	0	1	1	0		5
2	1	1	0	0	1	1	1		5
1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0		5
								I use Alma Bridge and Port Royal for easy and safe access to Sidmouth town and its amenities.	
1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0		5
1	2	0	0	0	1	1	0		5
								Derive great pleasure from a drive along the seafront and back daily.	
1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0		1
								I walk there everyday, observe the sea and enjoy the open green space area and walk by the river	
1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0		5
								Walking to seafront, accessing coastal path, using the fish shop toilets & sailing club	
1	2	0	0	0	1	1	1		5
1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	walking	5
1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0		1
								I like the local shops, walk or picnic on the beach, my grandchildren use the watersports facility	
1	2	1	0	0	0	1	0		5
1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0		5

1		2	1	0	0	0	1	0		5
1		1	1	0	1	0	1	1		5
1		1	0	0	0	0	1	0	running, walking, watching the sea, relaxing, socialising and as a customer of the fish shop	5
1		1	0	1	0	1	1	0	As part of daily exercise, walking along the coast each day and enjoying the views.	5
1		2	0	0	0	1	1	1		5
1		2	0	0	0	0	1	0	I walk and cycle along the Esplanade	5
1		1	1	0	0	0	1	0		5
1		2	1	0	0	1	1	0	Walking and running	5
1		2	1	0	0	1	1	0		5
3		4	1	0	0	0	1	0	Shopping at Sidmouth Trawlers	5
1		2	1	0	0	1	0	0	Also walk through the area and along the seafront	5
1		1	1	0	0	0	1	0	Regular walks along the sea front, occasional use of public toilets, visits to Lifeboat house.	5
1		1	0	0	0	1	1	0		5
1		1	0	0	0	0	1	0		
4	(Deleted DPA)	1	0	0	1	0	0	0		4
4	(Deleted DPA)	1	1	1	0	1	1	1		5
1		1	0	0	0	0	1	0		
1		1	1	0	0	0	1	0	A frequent walker, photographer, appreciator of Sidmouth's historic seafront.	5

1		1	1	0	0	1	1	0		5
1		2	0	0	0	0	1	0	(Deleted DPA)	
1		1	0	0	0	1	1	0		5
2		2	1	1	0	1	1	1	I use this area for a wide range of activities and as part of a walking route etc.	5
1		1	0	0	0	0	0	0	For walking and relaxation.	2
1		1	1	0	0	1	1	0	Visiting the lifeboat centre. Enjoying the charm of the area which is unique. Going to fish shop.	5
4	(Deleted DPA)	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	(Deleted DPA)	5
1		1	1	0	0	1	1	0		5
1		1	1	0	0	1	1	0	My parents live here	5
1		2	0	0	1	1	0	0		4
3		1	0	0	0	1	1	0		5
1		3	1	0	0	1	1	0		5
1		2	1	0	0	1	0	0		5
1		2	1	0	0	1	1	0		5

Q5a Would you like to see food and drink outlets on the Port Royal allocated site?

Q5b If yes, please tell us what type of food and drink outlets you would like to see:

2

1

2

A venue for entertainment, food and drink would be good.

1

A decent restaurant and wine bar with live music licence. A diner style burger bar that kids can afford.

1

3

2

0

3

A fish restaurant with a view of the sea.

1

3

2

A high quality restaurant, possibly with a regional reputation.

1

Sidmouth Trawlers, Bistro / Café

1

3

Only for Drill Hall area. Fish restaurant.

1

A few mid range restaurants, mainly with a nod to where they are; beach, fishing, the sea, red cliffs. Quirky, not standard chain type outlets. Quality, but reasonably priced and they need to be open!!

1

High end restaurant catering for families and visitors e.g. Rockfish

1

3

- 1 No fast food but a restaurant.
- 1 Traditional tea room. No more coffee shops! Definitely no chains!! Restaurant with a varied menu using local produce - very low carbon footprint.
- 1 Quality restaurants (several) - tapas, bars, outdoor eating facilities.
- 1 Allsorts
- 1 Good quality restaurants. No more cafes or coffee shops needed in Sidmouth. Possibly a bar or bistro.
- 1 Restaurants with outdoor / balcony tables. Club bar for joint use of sailors, rowers, runners, anglers.
- 3
- 2
- 1 A smart up market seafood restaurant with a named chef or popular fish restaurant chain.
- 2
- 1 A good quality restaurant with wide, open balcony or terrace and / or glass screening with panoramic views to coastline e.g. Rockfish.
- 3
- 1 Wine / cocktail and tapas bar. Elegant but affordable.
- 2
- 1 Would like to see a branch of Rockfish restaurant open in Sidmouth. Somewhere to eat in the evening that has a wider age range appeal but good quality food.
- 1 Café / restaurant / wine bar
- 1
- 2
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 1 Coffee shops with outside seating / no traffic.
- 1
- 2

- 1 Café / bar type outlets with outdoor seating areas and some shelter canopy arrangement.
- 3
- 3
- 3
- 2
- 1 Restaurant, quality, with views.
- 2
- 1 Café good. Separate from club facilities. Commercialisation of clubs would be a disaster.
- 1
- 1 Would be good to have outlets to appeal to younger population. Somewhere providing local produce would also be good.
- 2
- 1 Quality restaurant / high class café.
- 1
- 1 Good quality Italian restaurant (sadly lacking in Sidmouth) or fish restaurant. Should have use of sea facing location. Definitely not just a coffee shop and not a fast food outlet.
- 1
- 1 Accessible restaurant for all ages and abilities. Bars. Family friendly milk bars.
- 1
- 1 A smart restaurant / bar. Not a pub.
- 1
- 1 Upmarket signature restaurant drawing people from nationwide and helping hotels and shops.
- 1
- 1 Local produce with a twist, vibrant, bar, outdoor balcony dining and drinking.
- 1
- 1 Casual waterfront restaurant; seafood, fajitas, pizzas.
- 1
- 1 A status restaurant.
- 3
- 1 Named restaurant e.g. Rick Stein
- 1
- 1 High quality seafood or Italian café / bistro. No fast food or stalls.
- 1
- 1 But not a coffee bar / café. Restaurant would be good.
- 1

2
1
1
3
1
2
2
2
2
2
1
3
2
2
2
2
2
1
1
1
2
2
2
0

One or two units for the kids but also night time venues for adults.

A seafood restaurant, possibly operated by a name in this type of cuisine. There is scope to introduce a piazza style with other specialist foods offered.

Quality / specialist restaurant, not McDonalds, KFC or Wetherspoons.

As part of the sailing club.

Café. Bar. Restaurant. All without traffic interrupting the view.

Restaurant and bar overlooking the sea. Light refreshments / café on pavement.

Drill Hall used as an events hall with café and bar. Good to have a fish restaurant.

1 Cost effective but quality food, nice lunchtime menus that are something a bit different.

2

2

1

3

No more cafe's! An upscale restaurant/ bar with balcony seating and a waterfront patio would be great. If the wet fish shop is to be moved, maybe they should be given the option to take up a space in the new buildings. Most of this could be done within the area of the Drill Hall. Also, if the angling/ sailing/ gig club are to be allocated new storage areas, they should be able to maintain an area to keep the social side of the clubs going.

1

1 Rockfish fish restaurant or similar fish orientated restaurant such as loch fynne. Italian Restaurant/ Mediterranean.

1

2

1 Small restaurant and or tea/coffee bars. which in my opinion would bring more people to the Port Royal end of Sidmouth sea front.

1

2

3

1 Tea shop Restaurant

1

1 high quality local food

1

For starters no more coffee shops!!! Sidmouth has been overrun with these as of late. More continental style/modern pub/eateries. Also with the possible closure of Sidmouth's only night club this side of town mainly away from residential and close proximity buildings would be an ideal venture for a pub/nightclub/music venue.

1

1 Something in keeping with local fishing and marine use of this area

1

1 Chain restaurant like Prezzo or cafe rouge

1

I harbour area created similar to Exmouth with fewer than 30 flats but higher quality with their own jetty area by each flat so more can be charged so fewer needed. The development you have shown has no imagination and does not use the area to its maximum potential. This is the cheapest and easiest option, it does not fit in with the local area, take account of the conservation area and looks ugly and too large. Think again.

1

2

There are already many food outlets in Sidmouth so this area should be for sea activities like boating, fishing and the like. Any food outlets should not replicate what we already have.

1

3

All day restaurant/bar.

1

2

3

2

2

Coffee Shop type

1

2

A quality restaurant with a sea view and potentially a well known chef to attract visitors would be great. Any cafe should be child friendly - we have too many cafes and eateries in Sidmouth already and not enough that welcome and work for families with kids. A cafe with a play place for young families and an art gallery or something for other visitors would be great. This would also attract people to the seafront and town even in winter when weather is not so good. We do not want another cafe of the same ilk as everything we already have. I would also strongly resist any big brand coffee shops or eateries. To be in keeping with the character of the sea front any business should be specialist or unique.

1

Any of the better chains e.g.. Loch Fyne, Brasserie Blanc, Azzuro (have a look at Portsmouth Gunwharf Quays)

1

Sea facing café/restaurant

1

2

2

2

Café/Restaurant.

1

Reasonably priced family friendly restaurant, pizza express or similar would be good.

1

Both eat in & take-away

1

2
1
3
1
3
1
3
3
2
1
1
3
3
2
2
2
2
2
2
2
2
2
2
2
2
1

Cafe type restaurants with sea views

cafés/restaurants

Quality independent restaurants, seafood restaurants. No more cafes!

Restaurants - maybe some chains, Nandos, etc.

A budget public house such as a Wetherspoons, restaurant specialising in local produce (especially fish), roof terrace area with sea views, affordable chain restaurant e.g. Prezzo. No more coffee shops or hotels - we have enough now.

A main thing missing in Sidmouth is a cafe/restaurant with outside tables directly on the seafront. This should be possible with the removal of the planned pedestrianisation/removal of turning circle.

2

3

3

Restaurant - preferably reasonably priced chain like Pizza Express, Prezzo etc. Also be good to have a coffee shop preferably with outside space. We have expensive restaurants within the hotels, limited choice of other restaurants

1

Coffee shops/restaurants

1

1

Cafe for users of the open space, playground and promenade.

1

3

3

2

2

3

2

Café / restaurant

1

Yes, but affordable. No 5* posh eateries.

1

High quality restaurant/ cafe as part of the multi-function facility

1

Cafe or bar

1

2

A good cafe, such as Connaught Clock Tower cafe at the West end. Possibly a bar - though if the Sailing club Bar were open to the public this may suffice ...

1

2

Sidmouth needs a restaurant with views over the sea. We do not need more coffee shops or fast food outlets.

1

non alcoholic. café only during the day time. vegetarian and fish café. no more than one café. no shop otherwise this leave to littering and encourage seagulls so no take always please.

1

3

non alcoholic . no takeaways as this will encourage the seagulls and litter. café only during the day/ early evening.

1

wine bar or a nice bistro. Perhaps something a bit more upmarket. Sidmouth food outlets are mainly quite disappointing, with the exception of pea green and blinis.

1

3

3

3

fish and local produce promoted with independent restaurants

1

A great independent seafood café/restaurant, serving locally caught sustainable seafood/produce.

1

2

Café would be very good, coffee, cakes etc.

1

3

2

3

A cafe or restaurant in the refurbished drill hall would be welcomed.

1

2

2

2

3

2

2

3

1
1
2
1
2
1
1
1
1
2
2
1
2
2
2
1
1
2

Only if they were slanted towards a smaller locally run place rather than one big national concern

Conversion of the Drill Hall into a community space to include a restaurant or bar would give Sidmouth another unique attraction which is part of the charm of Sidmouth that attracts so many visitors willing to spend money in the town.

Independent cafe or restaurant making use of natural resources, i.e. local fish catches, and other produce; providing jobs and apprenticeships for young people and local workers.

Maintain fish shop and perhaps a central cafe/meeting area for watersports enthusiasts and other people involved with water activities

I'm not against new food and drink outlets provided that they are a quality offering which reflects the heritage and nature of the Port Royal area. I wouldn't want to see national chain outlets moving in and the area can't support more than one or two offerings

We already have a fish shop which serves food to take away The Neighbourhood Plan survey results show that there is public hostility to any take-away facility - and not much enthusiasm for a restaurant either. I'd be in favour of a 'food and drink outlet' if it were categorically not a national chain - but a small-scale, local venture - ideally attached to the already-existing Sailing Club or refurbished Drill Hall. When people are presented with the notion of a 'multi-function facility' they do not imagine being presented with the same facilities already on site - plus a rather expensive restaurant and even more expensive holiday flats. In other words, an additional 'food and drink outlet' is definitely not a priority - at least as far as the respondents to the NP questionnaire are concerned.

A cafe / restaurant / bar that provides locally sourced food based on locally and sustainably caught fish.

Coffee shop with tables outside

2

1 Food related to fishing activities, to retain the marine atmosphere of the area, and support the local fishermen/shop

1 Independent local outlets which value the fishing heritage and local identity of the area.

1 Question 5 is too vague and misleading

1 Cafe - not pub.

1

2

This entirely depends on the form of outlets to which you refer - the question does not specify whether it is referring to local independent businesses, luxury artisanal delis or bakeries, grocery shops or chain/corporate outlets.

1 Light refreshments cafe

1

2

Outdoor seating. A quality fish restaurant. Maybe a wine bar. Perhaps a space for a pop-up restaurant to give new entrepreneurs a chance to test their ideas.

1

Something unique. Not more coffee!!! No canteen style outlets but more thoughtful spaces with a feel and decor of the sea. A fish restaurant/ informative about the sea and fishing. Choose outlets which don't copy what Sidmouth already has, e.g.

Spanish/Thai/Italian...a fusion perhaps and even a taverna style outlet. It should be in keeping and have some Victorian features along with the modern, such as glass which is not too intrusive. Regarding drinks, maybe a cocktail style bar with not only alcohol but trendy non-alcoholic drinks. Definitely within a building which enables more people to look over the sea and enjoy the beautiful views. A five storey, brick built affair would be obscene.

1

High quality restaurant(s) are need in the town; We wold not support retail shops, a hotel or amusement arcade type facilities

1

2

2

small cafe for teas etc.

1

2

2

1

Q6 How much do you agree or disagree with the new and improved facilities for Sidmouth Lifeboat happening on the Port Royal allocated site?

Q7a How much do you agree or disagree with a new multi-function facility being provided on the Port Royal allocated site?

Q7b Please tell us the reasons for your answer to question 7:

- 1 4 Overcrowding of the site
- 2 1 It would bring new life to the area.
- 1 1 There has been a big change in use of the water with sailing, angling, kayaking, sea swimming, windsurfing, kite surfing, paddleboarding and surf lifesaving club. These clubs are an integral part of the community and encourage all generations to utilise the natural environment of the sea. A ramp for the lifeboat would be a massive advantage and save wasted time driving to Clifton Beach to launch.
- 1 1 I think it's really important to encourage and develop the sporting clubs and celebrate the multi-generational use especially younger members of the community who use these facilities / clubs.
- 2 1 who use these facilities / clubs.
- 3 2 Important that the sailing club is situated at Port Royal.
- 2 2 Provides a strong local resource - would welcome a wider inclusion beyond stated clubs etc.
- 1 2 The area from the ladies toilets and where the seating is invites a place of special interest, something unusual and attractive.
- 4 3
- 2 2 Could the lifeboat be located at a purpose built site at the other end of the Esplanade?
- 2 2 These watersports should be encouraged.
- 5 1 The sailing Club, Angling Club and Gig Club contribute to the wellbeing and health of those participating and watching.
- 2 1 Support for the watersports activities currently in operation, plus additional in the future.
This development must take in the needs and desires of the regular users of the Port Royal area and not just be a money making experience. It's a pity that this project can't be combined with improving the launching facilities for boats e.g. a jetty, creation of a small sheltered harbour area.
- 2 1 project can't be combined with improving the launching facilities for boats e.g. a jetty, creation of a small sheltered harbour area.
- 3 1 It is vital that the town provides facilities for water based sports for residents and others.
- 5 5 What would the rent be? Much too high!
While a multi function facility sounds attractive, we would not be happy if to acquire this the area was dominated by an overlarge out of character building.
- 3 3 Improvements for / by the clubs could be achieved at a fraction of the cost.
A joint club venue would suit the needs of all watersport / fishing and community. The age group of the various clubs includes children / teenagers (Lifeguard training) and all adults.
- 5 1 training) and all adults.

1 1
1 1 Supports local community, provides a focal point for tourists and will attract more visitors.
The existing clubs need to be relocated and developed. It would be good to focus all watersports offered in one area rather than having them spread along the
1 1 beach (as now).
3 4
4 3 Depends on where storage / unsightly parts go!
All watersports clubs mentioned should be provided with replacement facilities in the redevelopment of Port Royal and a base for community activities / use in
2 2 place of the dilapidated Drill Hall would be welcome.
1 1 Vital to foster an active, varied, community use of the sea. Precedents for this type of multi-function facility exist all over the South West e.g. Falmouth.
5 5 It will destroy that which currently draws visitors back year after year. They return to Sidmouth because of its changelessness.
1 1
2 1 There are over 500 people belonging to all the various groups that use the facility. Important to keep these activities at Port Royal.
Not enough information provided really. Have instinctive reluctance, (Deleted DPA). Better view and cocktails for those who want it. This end is used by people
1 5 who prefer a pint!
3 1 A multi function facility with function space and bar facilities for hire by clubs and social groups is needed, as per the sailing club function room.
3 3 Am not a member of any of the clubs so don't know whether a combined facility would be in their interests or not.
3 1 Sports ok, but arts yes please. More every day like open mics, gigs, comedy, workshops, conferences, weddings, dancing (not clubbing).
2 2
Buildings are scruffy and turning circle bleak looking. Will improve area visually, attract more people to use sailing facilities. But don't want a huge out of character
1 1 modern block of a building like the one I've seen on Exmouth seafront.
2 1 Joined up activities can only be a positive for Sidmouth. A multi-function facility would be good for all ages.
As a user of this area I believe it is vital to make sure that local clubs have the premises and areas to operate. Good access to the sea is essential and needs to be
made as easy as possible. With a building being used for multiple water based users there will be noise generated which could affect residential property owners,
this needs to be considered. Boat parking is an important factor. The current sailing club is restricted in its membership due to the size of the area available for
1 1 boat parking.
0 0
2 2 Is there really enough room? Could the lifeboat be launched at this site? Could we have a gym above the swimming pool?
2 2 It probably makes sense for all watersports clubs plus the lifeboat to share launch facilities, rather than the expense of duplication.
At the moment the facilities are very old and run down. A more cohesive approach to outdoor activity and lifeboat housing, with a more vibrant eastern end to
1 1 the Esplanade would be exciting.
3 3
2 2 New fit for purpose facilities, if carefully designed could unify the area and improve current status. Replace Drill Hall with more useful / pleasant facilities.
2 2 Maintain watersport is important. Plus keep fresh fish shop.
Clearly existing facilities need to be incorporated. It's too early to say what other facilities could be involved, or what potential users may come forward. It's
2 2 unlikely that the site will involve a community hall.

- 4 4 The above mentioned facilities probably need to be upgraded - however placing a 5 storey monstrosity there is not aesthetically or environmentally sound. Where do residents park? What about the noise and extra rubbish? Not a happy bunny - this is madness.
- 5 5
- 1 1 It would be a big draw for the area providing a water sports based attraction. A massive boost for tourism. Lifeboat, sailing and angling and swimming are all fundamental to the character of Sidmouth. This area is critical to allowing Sidmouth to get out to sea. It works well and has charm now due to being a working area, this will be lost if it is redeveloped. It is used by many children for swimming and other sports, we must
- 1 1 retain this.
- 3 3 Concern over club status of above users. Will the sailing club stay a club with the benefits of that/ That part of Sidmouth looks sadly neglected and a new multi function facility would breathe life and energy into the area. Would have positive impact on the local
- 1 1 economy.
- 3 5 It would mean owners of flats would be complaining all the time, it would ruin the view and it doesn't look very nice and we're already short on parking.
- 1 1 A vibrant social hub and facilities for the public with club facilities is vital. New premises for existing clubs / activities would be welcome, to upgrade the existing buildings. Lifeboat would benefit from a new launching ramp opposite the
- 1 1 current lifeboat house. There is growing interest in all forms of watersports / exercise activities and these should be encouraged.
- 1 1 Multi purpose building including lifeguard station to include lifeguard.
- 1 0
- 3 3 Don't spoil the building trying to be all things to all people. Why is the lifeboat situated there when it launches from the other end of the seafront! Be braver. Fish shop is pointless and should be made to go into the town.
- 1 1 Improved use for everyone, liven up the area.
- 1 1 We need to maximise the ocean as a source a fun facility. Entertain Sidmouth's youth.
- 2 2 To provide more facilities for the many events that go in in Sidmouth, festivals etc.
- 1 1 Connects Sidmouth to the sea to make a truly seaside resort, not simply a view of the sea.
- 1 1
- 1 1 Preserves heritage and institutions. Maintains safety area. Encourages and develops water sport activities. Greater space for public events, shows and exhibitions.
- 2 2 Keeps life in the community.
- 2 3 Existing facilities are adequate. Improvement, maintenance of existing buildings would be adequate.
- 1 1 Creates a positive energy attracting more people to the town.
- 0 1 The sailing, gig and angling club and others are a well supported and vibrant aspect of sea based activity in town and deserve strong support.
- 1 1 I want to see Sidmouth continue to be a watersports centre of excellence.
- 1 1 To increase the attraction to Sidmouth of users of such facilities.
- 2 1 A multi function facility will be a great asset to the town, both for locals and drawing in visitors to Sidmouth. If the only way of providing improved facilities for the lifeboat, sailing and gig club is by building 30 new apartments with the car parking requirements we prefer
- 3 3 that the lifeboat, sailing club stay as they are.
- 5 5 All this is already at Port Royal.
- 5 5 All the above facilities already exist without the need for development or a money making scheme to fund it.
- 1 2 The site should be used for the existing uses for enhancement and development as and when needed.

Tourists don't want a massive imposing block of flats obscuring the east cliffs. Sidmouth seafront will look as ugly as Seaton with its modern block of flats. Only rich people will buy flats in a seaside location. Affordable housing is needed and these can be somewhere else. All the current buildings at Port Royal should be kept.

I do not see the need to bulldoze what is there i.e. the lifeboat station, sailing club, angling club and drill hall. Why not refurbish them and preserve this historic site. Mixed use presents various clashes of interest and provides issues of disagreement particularly with residential use.

Agree the sailing club / gig club etc. would benefit from better facilities. This does not mean an entire new building at enormous cost. Re-furbishment would suffice.

Any development should cover all sea based activities that encourage visitors to come to Sidmouth.

Watersports are healthy activities which should be encouraged and offer opportunities for people of all ages and especially young age groups.

Not if it involves 5 storey building of indifferent design.

Some of these facilities would be better placed at the other end of the promenade where it's easier to launch boats. However, a multi purpose facility would bring activities and interest to people enjoying a meal or a drink.

Multi purpose restaurant / bars work well throughout Australia and can act as a focus for the whole community for entertainment.

As per question 4 I strongly disagree with the 5 storey multi function proposal. The consultant has ignored the constraints of the site i.e. a conservation area and the Ham covenant, and has only proposed a single option i.e. Hobsons Choice.

The sea defence scheme must be considered alongside any building at Port Royal. Five floors is too high and 30 apartments over development. 30 permanent cars parked on ham car park will make the spaces available inadequate for visitors and not suitable for the types of apartments envisaged.

A new multi function facility will end up giving us less space, less facilities at a much higher price.

Question states 'could'. Very ambiguous, either will or won't. Will rent remain the same? Will each club have their own area? Non specific? Less facilities for more money?

As a sea based activities area. Entertainment venue with strict noise and environment restrictions.

It's a good place for it.

I would need to see how they actually think the building would be divided. When the weather is bad the sea crashes heavily on the Angling/Sailing Club as it is. (Deleted DPA) stuffed on the ground level it would not work. Also we need visual access to the sea for fishing and sailing competitions etc.

As mentioned in my answer to Q5, the clubs in question have many social events throughout the year, which enables them to bring in a reasonable income, all this of course is subject to any rent agreement being of a sensible amount, so as not to bankrupt any of the clubs. As for potentially having a community 'public hire' unit, this already happens within the Port Royal building, hosting wedding receptions, birthdays etc.

Adequate provision already. New Spa / Gym attached to leisure centre would be better use of space

In the UK we are very fortunate to have largely free access to our beaches and the sea. We should do everything possible to make that access easy and available for the public to enjoy. Generally developments of this sort seek to keep the public away and increase the exclusivity of the development. That should be avoided at all costs.

I have visited Sidmouth quite a lot over the 6 years I have lived in the area and always found the Port Royal area to be very unattractive to any visitor, so redevelopment of the area can only be for the better.

- 1 3 The views of the people who belong to these clubs are the important ones.
- 1 1
- 1 1 Water sports facilities needed Attractions needed to bring people up to that end of the promenade.
- 1 1 The Port Royal currently contains a community area and the development should protect or contain such
To have a one building fits all seems more practical than these businesses having numerous other buildings. The allowance of a more community open space will also be fitting for the setting. Additionally sidmouth has nothing for younger generations The Ocean bowling and indoor play centre in Exmouth would be a fantastic opportunity to provide the youngsters of sidmouth more activities. Also it will give the many international students somewhere and something to do
- 1 1 rather than roam the streets/byes and cause nuisance.
I feel the present lifeboat and sailing club premises are adequate and in keeping with the area, Port Royal development should only replace the old derelict hall and public toilets with a new marine themed restaurant with flats over and toilets incorporated . The block as shown is far too dense and will require far more parking spaces and traffic than the area can cope with and inhibit easy access of the lifeboat . The Historic fishing huts of Ham fishmongers should be preserved and perhaps incorporated with a fishing museum or some such . The area is far too restricted for parking and vehicle access already without adding significant
- 5 5 vehicles to the area...., footfall access should be encouraged however
- 1 1
- 5 5 It does not appear to show much on the plans or show where boats would be launched from.
- 5 5 do something with the drill hall and leave the rest alone
- 2 2 Keeping all the present facilities in the Port Royal area is vital to maintain what Sidmouth is all about i.e. the sea and activities around the sea.
- 6 5 I accept my knowledge of their needs is limited but I feel both buildings are fine for the area and do not think I sizeable building is appropriate
- 1 This area is currently used by these clubs and activities and there is no realistic alternative site on the sea-front.
- 2 1 They are a valued part of the town, these facilities must not be lost
- 3 2 The area is a hub of community activity - therefore anything to strengthen social activities between residents would be much welcomed.
It seems to me that it has been decided that there must be lots of flats, there must be bars / cafes etc. then a process of justification is taking place. The starting point should be what is needed and will genuinely benefit Sidmouth, its residents, its visitors, the businesses etc. For example, if the lifeboat needs / wants improved facilities then I would include that - within reason. Likewise for the sailing club. Questionnaires make the possibility of putting together a rational
- 3 3 argument difficult but my overall viewpoint, as someone who loves Sidmouth, is encompassed in 12 below.
The water based activities are split between both ends of the Esplanade. The lifeboat, surf life saving and Jurassic Paddle Sports need to be at Clifton Beach, where safe launching of sailing dinghies, rowing gigs and light craft is also possible. The Port Royal end of the Esplanade is better for the commercial fishing boats and sea angling but the beach does disappear regularly and winches are dangerous in pubic areas. To incorporate the lifeboat and sailing club into the proposed building will only make it oversized. To re-site these facilities towards Clifton Beach will pull all the pleasure and safety craft together. It will also reduce the response time of the lifeboat. Clifton Beach is the safer place for these activities. Developing the Arches backwards under the Cricket Club should be explored - there are obvious restrictions/issues around the height of building required for the lifeboat. Dinghy storage under the Cricket Club would have no impact on the
- 1 4 look of the frontage.
- 6 1 Ideal place for them to be based. The Lifeboat should be at the Western End of the Esplanade to be able to launch quicker.
- 5 5 Why can't the Gig club etc. use a renovated Drill Hall?????
- It shouldn't be exclusive to water based community groups. It could incorporate a function room with bar that is hireable for parties and events as we do not have many venues available for this sort of thing. We need community places that welcome children and families and attract visitors, not just club space for a
- 1 2 proportion of the locals that are interested in watersports. Sidmouth is sadly lacking play and entertainment facilities for youth and children. Exmouth's Ocean is a

great example of a very successful seafront development that encompasses activities for young, venues for hire and a restaurant. I fully support the Port Royal venue also supporting our local clubs but not for that use exclusively.

Sailing Club, Gig Club etc. are an important part of Sidmouth's social clubs and water sports history; they are all vibrant and active and should be retained for our future generations of youngsters to enjoy.

The existing sports facilities should continue and be expanded if funds permit. That part of development could be financed by lottery funds, Sport England grants, etc. so that the flat development could be reduced to no more than three storeys.

This area needs "tidying up" generally and, at the moment, is underused. However it is no use doing this without adequate parking facilities. As I read your proposals you are doing all these improvements but doing away with all the car parks. This is a big mistake.

It is difficult to see any other area of the beach which could accommodate these activities.

The site is adjacent to the foreshore so it makes sense to have marine associated facilities available. This is an opportunity to incorporate them within a new development.

Together with improved access to the sea (jetty?), and the pedestrianisation of the area next to the sea, this will bring an interesting and active focus to the east end on the town attracting younger people and families both from the area and visiting the area. Increasingly successful sea side resorts are places where people visit to do sea based activities, not just sitting in the sun.

Not at any cost - The size of the buildings should not exceed Trinity Court, and I would prefer to see a much smaller building.

a. The current facilities in this area need to stay in this area b. Functions held in this area have always been successful c. The Fish business is PART OF SIDMOUTH and should remain here as long as the owners wish to continue d. These Clubs and facilities are a big part of what makes Sidmouth what it is and they can and

should benefit from an improved site being provided using Council funding

I fully agree the area needs development but not up to 5 storeys.....

Not sure whether we need this facility

It would not in my opinion be viable to have a social club and housing in the same building. How would you (EDDC and Sidmouth Council) expect the yacht club to oversee it's races and utilise the safety system which includes a loud horn from a site that includes dwellings without raising antagonism between wealthy residents and the yacht club members? and how would you adjudicate such conflicts?

They need it!

Great opportunity for young people to be active, a resource for the community, HOWEVER THOSE USING THE SITE AT PRESENT WILL HAVE A STRONG VISION IF YOUNG PEOPLE ARE INVOLVED IN THE CONSULTATION

although not sure how the mix will work - (Deleted DPA) - the use of air horns for sailing starts and finishes will be a nuisance to home owners and will cause constant friction between users. Also washing through engines after use will also cause a nuisance (this is a necessary function).. Also to help make the clubs viable the venue is hired out for parties on a regular basis. (Deleted DPA). Generally the people who will be able to afford these apartments will be retirees or second home owners looking for a quite time. The two don't mix.

These facilities (and the lifeboat) are vital to the life of the town, especially if Sidmouth wants to minimise the perception as being 'a place for old people'. Such facilities create a part of the character of the town as a dynamic seaside resort for all. Even non-users enjoy watching the activities. Take away those facilities and you would wreck the town. Therefore they must be provided come what may. However, refurbishment of the current facilities would maintain the character far more effectively than building a big housing block with lifeboat/club facilities underneath. SO, I AGREE THE FACILITIES ARE NEEDED BUT NOT IN A HIGH-RISE

BLOCK.

I'm not going to use it. These are elitist pastimes for the few not the many.

2 1 A multi-function facility will contribute to Sidmouth's sense of community, it will create a space for young people to enjoy and help Sidmouth's clubs/societies to thrive. A beautiful space with panoramic views of the seafront for events would be a popular place for weddings and the like.

2 2 Are needs tidying up and developing whilst incorporating the existing facilities - lifeboat, sailing club , fish shop. However, this does not need to include residential units particularly a high rise building.

1 2 To let out the space for other events may be not good for new residents

4 5 Everything seems to be functioning adequately as it is, maybe a bit of money spent to enhance the look of things would help.

5 5 What we have on the site already is adequate for the needs and size of Sidmouth. A huge development would detract completely from why Sidmouth is so special. A beautiful un spoilt seaside town. Look at the horrible development at Exmouth which has been ruined.

1 2 existing buildings a blot on the landscape at the moment, need renewing. Fort building a bit of a mess too but rest of frontage very much in keeping with a Victorian-type seafront which is much admired by visitors, part of the reason they come here, very important to sidmouth's economy

4 3 I would like to know if the current position of the lifeboat station needs more direct access to the beach rather than having to launch by tractor from the other end of the esplanade

5 5 The current facilities for the Sailing/Gig/Angling Clubs could (and should) be easily "updated" and improvedtogether with the restoration of the Drill Hall. The unique sea front of Sidmouth must be preserved for future generations. . This new development, if allowed, will destroy and ruin the unique character and beauty of Sidmouth's seafront for ever. It must NOT be allowed.

5 5 The proposal so far seems to be devoid of character, ugly, oversized

5 4 There is adequate provision already for these organisations and as it is on a flood plain, residential building is inappropriate and unsafe. The existing buildings are a charming collection that reflect Sidmouth's history.

4 4

3 3 I support rehousing the various clubs as part of the development but with the following provisos: - any improvement in facilities should largely be funded by the clubs themselves OR - they must be open for the public to hire/use

5 5 This is just an excuse to develop. A sop. From where comes the pressure to develop this site? From the community? Or from the developers? The facilities are fine as they are. With this development Sidmouth is selling its soul and trashing its heritage. Our town, our economy, relies upon its charm and undeveloped nature. Tourists come here to get away from high-rise and high-density development in their own towns. They are seeking the charm and nostalgia of a town "as it used to be".

2 2 Any development of the area should retain the historic Drill Hall building, which, if refurbished and reused would enhance the area and confirm Sidmouth as a place that cares passionately about development that retains the character of this area

2 2

1 1 This new development needs to be for the benefit of as many divers members of the public and locals as possible

5 5 The present facilities are adequate. They may need only cosmetic improvements. Why are you trying to make money out of this venture ? WHO will be gaining from this money making scheme? The developers....the Council....certainly not the residents! One wonders WHY.

1 1 I want a large fitness centre to be added to the swimming pool facilities. Quite happy for sailing, gig and angling clubs to be catered for.....move them into the lifeboat station. Residential can then utilise the sailing club site, in this way there can still be 30 residential units - whilst restricting the building to four stories.

1 4 Lifeboat accommodation needs to move to a better location for swift launchings, further down the Esplanade.

1 1 I don't disagree with improving facilities but think it is unrealistic to expect residents of the new homes to live above the Life Boat and Sailing Club. There will be complaints about noise etc. I also would object to apartments used as holiday flats. If there at all they should be affordable properties for local people. Life boat needs much quicker access to the sea to be truly effective

1 1 Present facilities should not be lost but could be improved.

1 1 Present facilities should not be lost but could be improved.

3 3 It would be unused for the majority of the year due to difficulties in launching boats from this end of the sea front.

1 1 I strongly believe that Sidmouth Sailing Club, Gig Club and Angling Club need to retain their current location.

3 2

5 5 This would completely ruin Port Royal. It would increase activity and noise from watersports, prevent coaches from turning forcing them to illegally back up down the road, prevent general use of Port Royal as a place for general community enjoyment (walking, enjoying the views, etc.).

2 2

2 2 The old Drill Hall is an eyesore as it is at present and could do with refurbishment for community use as above. I can also see that the Lifeboat Station may be in need of better facilities.

2 2 I am happy with the idea of a mixed-use building, especially if it was also available as a community space. However, I understand that in order to pay for it, residential space would have to be created, and I am opposed to such a development in a sensitive area, especially as it requires the height of the building to be out of all proportion to other buildings along the Esplanade.

5 5 We already have facilities for the sailing club and gig club. We do not need a massive new building, completely out of keeping with existing buildings and the natural landscape, and including 30 apartments, in order to help to provide facilities that we already have. The proposal is completely inappropriate for a Conservation Area, and an area which represents part of the setting for the Sidmouth coastline, which is part of a World Heritage Site.

2 2 I think the existing facilities should be enhanced

4 4 Not sure why this has to be all new AND then incorporate more flats to finance it. I would like to see more imaginative solutions explored in particular so we do not have a block filling up spaces which are varied and already "multi-use".

6 6

3 2 It seems sensible but the description is so vague it could mean a multitude of different facilities some of which would be good and some bad. hence the answer to question 8 below.

6 5 I think the proposal to include them in the block of flats to be totally unnecessary. We need to keep the area as a community focus.

1 1 Makes sense to provide facilities for existing and potential watersports clubs in one place. It would be helpful to have space for other community activities/event hire to make this a vibrant area of the town. This could really make Sidmouth a much more attractive place. The existing area looks drab and unwelcoming.

1 1 Valuable resources in Sidmouth. We do lack a jetty for visiting boats and hope this will be included

1 1 I object strongly to the alternative proposals being put forward by 4 councillors this weekend. There is no way the drill hall should be retained. I am in favour of your proposals but not 5 storeys high. We do need a jetty for visiting boats.

2 2 The lifeboat and yacht club need to be rehoused in a suitable position.

2 2 Facilities are all needed and are a part of Sidmouth Town life. Although the facilities can be improved this must not be at the expense of reduced space for users, e.g. boat parking.

3 2 Obviously all watersports clubs need a facility somewhere along the Sidmouth seafront

5 5

1 1 It is the right location for these functions which could be further improved by the provision of a launching slip and a small jetty

4 2 I favour having facilities for the various organisations mentioned and possibly some sort of performance space. I feel that the lifeboat would be better moved to a more convenient site if possible.

4 5 We already have a multi function facility at Port Royal - improvements to smarten/modernise the various premises could be a bonus, but not at the expense of the overall ambience of the area - where you can see across the roofs, look inland to the hills and see the distant sky, hear and see the children play in the park or

on the grass of the Ham. Sidmouth is a small town with a 'Regency' feel to it... I do not want the promenade buildings to overpower and create a Brighton, Bournemouth or other large seaside resort atmosphere - the scale of the proposal is so wrong!

1 1 This is a seaside town and it is important that a waterside location is accessible for all these facilities.

2 1 Although the community based bits should be separate from watersports club.

This is an important site for Sidmouth and facilities for the watersports clubs - and possibly other community uses - must be provided rather than just re-

2 1 developing for housing.

2 1 Already have this. How will this be better?

A building of this sort and size would almost certainly be too overbearing for this area the Esplanade section of which is designated as a conservation area.

3 4 See comments below.

All the sea related activities are important in seaside towns, and the sailing, gig, fishing etc. etc. groups are essential to the sea side character of Sidmouth, and should be kept in this prime sea front location. Residents and visitors enjoy seeing these activities, and joining them, they are such an integral part of a

1 1 coastal/seaside town like ours.

2 1 Sidmouth need to keep it's Sailing, angling and other water based activities as part of it's history and seaside town

Watersports are a vital feature of Sidmouth, as a seaside town; in addition to the benefits to club members, these uses provide a public benefit helping to keep the seafront lively and interesting. I am less convinced of the need for other community based activities on this site - I would like to see evidence that there is

3 1 currently an unmet need.

sailing club needs to be renovated and open to all if one buys a drink or food. we need to keep the turning circle. the area at the back of the fish shop needs tidying up and pull down the drill hall! unfortunately this area could be flooded in the next twenty years and is it a waste of money building a tall edifice? need to

3 2 ensure that there are public toilets in any new build.

a - tourism brings a lot of money into Sidmouth and the proposed development will put tourists off. They've come to see the seaside and the current Port Royal buildings are in keeping for a quirky seaside location and a massive imposing block is not in keeping (note how damaging the massive block of flats has been to Seaton seafront and how it has bought down the rest of Seaton seafront). b - flats with a seaside location will only be affordable to rich people. If Sidmouth needs another 30 houses then these should be affordable housing for local residents and these do not need to be on the sea front, they can be located elsewhere in the town. c - all the current buildings on Port Royal must be kept and renovated as appropriate. d - the only building which is obviously in need of significant

5 5 renovation is the drill hall, and this should be kept and upgraded for use for a community purpose.

2 2 to be able to pull down the drill hall and have a new fish shop and clear that area.

The waterspouts club, drill hall and toilets are very unsightly buildings, so could definitely do with updating. Boating is a big part of a seaside town and links to this should definitely be retained. I just don't agree with the new building being higher than the other buildings on the esplanade. It would look incongruous. The style

1 1 would also have to be in keeping with the surrounding buildings.

As you won't tell us exactly what will be there it is impossible to answer this question. The same applies to question 6 and 8. You are attempting to garner results on insufficient information about alternatives and commitments. The answers to these questions will not hold up to independent scrutiny.

6 6 The lifeboat station and sailing club building should be retained possibly with refurbishment. The drill hall should be refurbished and retained. Could it possibly be used as a shop outlet for the fish shop?. The huge building you are proposing would destroy the character of this end of Sidmouth and look awful.

4 5 Because it keeps the character of the area.

2 2 I think the existing structure could be improved rather than demolished to keep the historic feel of the area

It is so important to Sidmouth to house and retain these clubs. An updated multi functional facility in theory sounds good if it is done sympathetically and sits well within the surrounding area although perhaps this could also be achieved by updating the clubs buildings and facilities without the need to level what is already

2 2 there and having a total rebuild.

3 1 These facilities are essential to a seaside town. They are well supported by the community. They mainly use the less popular of the beaches for launching their

6 6 boats. Port Royal is the ideal position for them.
In both 6 and 7 it is down to the Clubs themselves to state what they require hence stating don't know or unsure to both questions their wishes should be paramount.

3 4 I tend to disagree because I cannot see how this could work along with housing or commercial premises. - I think actually what is there now serves these purposes adequately and any changes are likely to either, and probably both, increase the costs to such clubs and thereby decrease their viability, and not actually be as good as currently even if they look smart.

5 5 The sailing club has already a multi function use. Sailing club gig club angling club as well as the running club, all of which work well together. I certainly object to a 5 storey building site, which would block out the sea views and spoil the whole frontage of over lovely town of Sidmouth. Also there would not be room for the sailing boats and kayaks under these proposals. The members of The Sailing club work hard to keep the costs of membership down, and I can see that this proposal would put up the costs of membership sky high, barring a number of younger members thro costs. The only site which needs some improvement is The Drill Hall, but its overall look etc. should be retained as it is of historic value to both the town and the residents. Also the idea of the life boats being situated under a number of flats and waking up everyone when the lifeboat went out at night it just would not work. I think that we do not need these updates or proposals of buildings, it seems to me the only winners here will be the Developers who stand to make a great deal of money out of these ideas.

2 2 Maintaining the water sports and recreational facilities is very important and a multi-function facility could work providing it doesn't require a 5 storey monstrosity to be erected on the site. Sidmouth is renowned for it's heritage and historic architecture which would be tarnished significantly by a 5 storey building. How can 5 storey's possibly be 'in keeping with other buildings in the area'?? This would dwarf Trinity Court! The recent proposal put forward by the architect (Deleted DPA) has practical functionality as well as maintaining the aesthetics and heritage of the area. I believe alternate ending schemes could be found to fund the development rather than an additional 30 dwellings. Grants, crowd source funding, local investors. The private sector in the Sid Valley has a wealth of financial expertise and this should be used to come up with suitable funding schemes. Local businesses/private individuals might be inclined to part sponsor or set up a Special Purpose Vehicle (SPV) to fund parts/all of the development. Other funding options must be explored before the council fixes on additional dwellings for the site.

2 4 The focus seems to be improve facilities for 'private' clubs at local taxpayers' expense. Facilities should be available to local people and visitors to town. The statement includes a lot of 'could's and 'possibly'- it's all very vague. Alternative suggestions should be available. This consultation survey is badly worded and biased.

3 5 these clubs need their own space for storage and meeting, I do not see the viability of them renting a large area. There are so many halls in town we don't need another.

4 5 We don't need a big towering building to cast shadows everywhere and spoil the beach and the promenade.

5 5 It is stupid.

2 2 There is a need for some type of facilities to be available to be used by the younger generation, whether they are local or visitors to the area. We need to be able encourage more people to want to come to Sidmouth.

3 3 I wonder how much use a "multi-function" facility would really get, and how "multi-function" it would really turn out to be. It would probably end up being a low quality area for making money, and any residential apartments would be hard to sell, unless the west river wall is strengthened to sea wall condition or the East Cliff (Pennington Point no longer exists!) protected from erosion.

4 4 I am open to the Drill Hall being used as a multi-function facility but nothing purpose built

3 4 I feel that the present facilities could be developed, but see (Deleted DPA) proposals far more in keeping with the area, developing what is there. The idea of 5-story buildings is simply turning the Sidmouth seafront into yet another seaside town with a ruined visual frontage, at the expense of the sense of interest and

character of the existing area. It happens in so many seaside towns, and would really spoil the overall frontage view of the town. The homes are likely to be more holiday apartments that are frequently unoccupied, and certainly only available for the rich. The existing character of the area, for sailing, for the lifeboat, for fishing boats should be maintained, and also the Ham should not have anything built on it, as it was given as an open space for the people of Sidmouth. We certainly also don't want to encourage the slot-machine mentality, which will add noise and disruption to residents and visitors alike as they stand and enjoy the sea. Public conveniences should be maintained. Sidmouth is one of the few seaside towns where visitors say they can easily find loos.

I think it would be nice to have improved facilities for these clubs but not at the expense of the damage to the green space and appalling visual impact of the proposals which are totally out of proportion. Any re-development at the end of the seafront needs to be at a considerably reduced height so the beauty of the river estuary isn't overwhelmed.

This area was gifted to be used recreationally by the people of Sidmouth, both young, working and retired, and that is what it has been used for all my life. It is also the focus of the fishing/boating occupations of the town. We should preserve this historical and cultural aspect of our town, not destroy it. It should certainly not be gifted to wealthy out of towners who want a sea front apartment, and sited in a 5 storey building which would be an eyesore from the seafront and the bay. If apartments have to be built, put the current car park underground (a necessity for both town and shoppers) and build the apartments above it, where they would not obstruct anyone's view. Additionally, as no work has been done to protect this end of Sidmouth from sea flooding, apartments may have to be on stilts.

Sidmouth's charm is its lack of development. Do not ruin this attractive aspect of the town. East Devon is being over-run with unwanted modernisation and development. Visitors return year after year to Sidmouth because of its independent shops and unique timeless beautiful seafront area. Do not spoil it. A multi-function facility would be good, but NOT at the expense of demolishing everything that's already there. The Drill Hall is a valuable asset which should be included as part of the new facility; expanding to the east and including new toilets and possibly also west if this incorporated the sailing club. Any works must be sympathetic to the nature of Sidmouth. There must be no expansion onto the Ham or be any impact on the boats, fishermen or Folk Festival.

Provision for sports and community based activities would be a good use of this area of town, and an excellent community and family strengthening facility in Sidmouth, but updating what is there already, not encroaching on the Ham green area.

An area to be central to users of the sea, celebrating and maintaining the connection to the sea Sidmouth historically has. Teaching youngsters about the sea, a central area to meet and be on the water.

I don't think that it's possible for the Lifeboat, Sailing Club, Gig Club etc. to be adequately housed in the multi-function facility alongside restaurants and housing.

This feels like too much is being squeezed into a very small footprint/

Totally unnecessary. The existing buildings would be better retained and simply refurbished.

It is important that these clubs have facilities at the site but the proposed design is too big and too tall.

Because the facilities at Port Royal do not need to be 'new and improved': they are perfectly adequate as they are now. It is becoming clear that the option to flatten the whole site (preferred by developers) is not the only option. Indeed, it was disappointing that the option of refurbishing the above facilities was not given during the consultation. Furthermore, in the answers to the NP questionnaire, the priority for respondents was to keep these facilities - but there were no demands made for a 'completely fresh start' by demolishing the current buildings. Again, the notion of a 'multi-function facility' is not limited to what is being proposed by the consultants: the responses in the NP questionnaire offered a far wider choice of what could be made available.

The suggested redevelopment would be an overdevelopment of the area! Better to retain, refurbish and reuse

The existing facilities work. EDDC needs to maintain the Drill Hall while in its ownership. This was an excellent community facility which Sidmouth used a lot. To lose this would be a terrible loss of a historic asset our town made available for the benefit of the town, Capping all the existing facilities with apartments will mean there won't be any chance for these facilities to grow in years to come. It will block the open aspect of port royal. Closing it off to traffic will cause big traffic problems.

Community areas are what Sidmouth needs to keep it for all the people not just the chosen few. The drill hall is the community facility. It was used a lot. Why has EDDC not maintained this asset. They need to bring it back into use as soon as possible.

I agree that this is what is needed at Port Royal however it is not possible to properly answer this question as it does not include all aspects of the Port Royal site. For example it does not mention the Drill Hall. This question, and the consultation itself, should begin by listing all aspects of the Port Royal site and including the Drill Hall for example as a home for community based activities, and/or in relation to Q5 a location for a new food and drink outlet. Without at least presenting an option of using the Drill Hall as an opportunity to house the range of activities mentioned in Q5 and here in Q7 the consultation has no real relevance. Or, put something like, "would you like to see the Drill Hall demolished in order to build a brand new location for food and drink and community activities?"

It's a logical site for watersports clubs

New and improved are weasel words suggesting that this would be a price worth paying for the provision of a hideously large five storey building - whether or not the fifth storey was set back. There are better ways to improve club facilities.

A multi-function facility would be good but not at the expense of demolishing everything. There must be no expansion onto the Ham or any impact on the boats or folk festival.

Speaking as the representative of Sidmouth Lifeboat, we are committed to supporting our current neighbours and the local marine community and activities. Extension of the facilities to encompass other marine activities would enhance the area, and bring more visitors - and thus publicity and fund-raising opportunities for us. It would also strengthen the understanding of the history of this part of the Sidmouth, which is important to retain. Re Q6, although we support the proposal to retain our function in 'new and improved facilities at Port Royal', and fully understand that the proposed building is a concept at this stage, as an organisation, we feel that the 5-storey building is too high, and too dominant on the seafront. More than anything we are concerned about continuing to provide our service whilst any developments are taking place.

These facilities are vital to the area and must be retained whether through upgrade or a new facility. A cultural community hub should be provided which is versatile to accommodate the clubs, Sidmouth's festivals and provide much needed space for cultural and leisure events. This needs to be linked with the wet fish shop and the fishermen's sheds. The Lifeboat Station needs a launch as do the other boats in the area. This provides a tourist attraction in itself as people love to watch boats launched providing a captive audience for other sea based activities. Sidmouth Coastal Community Hub runs Sidmouth Sea Fest on the Ham, the event is limited as there is no suitable indoor venue to use for additional festival activities - this is the same for other festivals - all of which are contributing to the local economy but could do so much more with access to better community facilities.

Could? Possibly? To hire? question 7 is not a question but a series of vague suggestions. Where are the facts?

The development plan is far too large and ungainly - spoiling one of the best preserved, Regency sea fronts in Britain. It is astonishing that such a development could even be considered.

Once again, the question is deeply vague in nature - this could again refer to a multitude of different things, from the refurbishment of existing buildings to the construction of a marina (a project to which I would be strongly opposed). I also note here the use of vague and non definite vocabulary - 'could' and 'possibly' do not in any way fill me with confidence that local groups and their rights to facilities would be protected.

I feel youngsters need a place to have fun.

This is a biased question, as are questions 5 and 6. As previously stated it would be perfectly feasible to upgrade existing facilities without a 5 storey building that is completely out of keeping with Sidmouth and its regency setting. Have EDDC learnt nothing from previous consultations and nothing from other resorts which are no longer unique but ruined by high rise ugly buildings complete with second homes for the elite. I would like to know what the above mentioned organisations themselves think about this. Question 8 - needs a comments box - the charm of Sidmouth is that it has the feel of a fishing and traditional seaside town, that is why visitors love it and residents love living here. You should not sacrifice the heritage of the town.

- 1 1 We need energy in this part of town.
 I believe that to enhance the existing facilities would be good and to make greater access to the wider public Would be good for locals and tourists but needs careful guidance from those people who already run those facilities, as is too often the case; people in authority but with little knowledge in that particular field
- 6 2 are the ones to make the decisions at the end of the day...can the people already running those clubs be listened to.
- 3 1 see section 12
- 5 5 Current facilities more than adequate
- 3 4 Don't think it's needed and whole development would increase traffic to area impacting negatively on existing users and residents
- 2 2 there needs to be more attractive facilities in this area
- 2 2 The area needs improving & updating as do the facilities
- 1 1 Any development here should enhance the facilities for both local people and tourists.
- 2 1
 Whilst improved facilities for the Sailing, Gig and Angling clubs are to be welcomed, I do not agree with the proposed method for funding this. The development
- 3 3 proposed would be an eyesore.

Q8 If there was a new multi-function facility on the Port Royal allocated site, do you think you'd use the

Q9a How much do you agree or disagree with the new development including some of the area shown as E on board 3 and a new access route being provided

Q9b Please tell us the reasons for your answer to question 9:

area
more? from Ham
Lane?

2

4 I would regret any reduction to the Ham green area.

1

2 Why not build over the car park (flats) and keep seafront for leisure use.

1

The current turning circle by the Ham encourages many cars to drive to the end of the Esplanade where they cause congestion and park illegally, sometimes causing problems for boat users.

1

More space for clubs. No need to have cars turning down to have a look at the sea, this causes congestion and it would be a much better atmosphere for users of this end of the seafront.

1

0

3

3 Concerned as to exactly where would be the relocation of maritime activities /fish shop?

3

0 This area is uninteresting and needs the boats etc. stored better elsewhere.

3

4 No loss of car parking should be contemplated. No loss of Ham open space at all.

2

2 No problem with this as long as the ham car park remains.

3

2 It would open up the area.

1

A new access would be dangerous to those using the Ham and additionally would take away car parking spaces, which are in very short supply as it is. Definitely no loss of parking spaces.

2

3 I wouldn't want the access route to restrict an imaginative, landmark development.

1

It would encourage people to use York Street and Mill Street more. Both are narrow roads which struggle to cope with two way traffic now. It would also create major problems if the ford was closed.

1

1 There area needs to be improved in this way.

2

5 Loss of car parking

2

Mainly because nibbling away at the Ham is worrying! If the development took place with an overlarge, dominating building blocking off the view seawards from the Ham then this new path would go someway to making the best of the situation. However, it would be far preferable if

4 development was sized not to block off this unique view to sea!

3

1 Access is the key to the multi use of the area and if sensitively light could provide a walkway around the east side of the Esplanade. Maybe with an
1 extended garden sitting area.

2

2 Want to retain the maritime activities, better access would help.

2 While understanding the need to relocate existing clubs and the wet fish shop the reduction in car park spaces is a concern.

2 Access will be essential - this is the most obvious route. Again it's vitally important that this should be for the benefit of all residents and visitors and
2 not just a few sailing club / gig club members.

2 We should look at using the whole area and not designing piecemeal.

2 To provide a new purpose built space for maritime activities and storage to be accessed whilst permitting pedestrianisation of the Port Royal end of
2 the Esplanade.

1 New access would facilitate boat unloading / retrieved without blocking.

5 Change is not wanted. The wet fish shop is a landmark, not just a commodity. Visitors come looking for it, appreciate the good produce and enjoy
5 the maybe ramshackle but quaint real site.

3

2 Feel that the area could be much better organised.

3 Would need to see plans in more detail.

1 So that the Esplanade area on the seafront side of the building could be pedestrianised.

5 This area is pleasant, traffic free at present, ideal for pedestrians and cyclists. Traffic unwelcome.

2 Makes sense.

3

2 Currently is a bleak, windswept scruffy corner. Was walking alongside river there today and more could be made of that to improve visual impact, is
1 a waste of space as it is.

2

2 Need to consider all users of the area.

2

- 2 4 Don't think it helps.
- 3 3 Access is clearly important. Whether or not this is the best way to provide access that's for other experts to judge.
- 1 1 If vehicle access to the Esplanade at the east end was restricted this would be beneficial to visitors to this area.
- 3 3
- 1 2 Area needs updating and Drill Hall is not fit for purpose, it is not an enhancement to the Esplanade at present.
- 3 2 Make one way route along seafront and through Sidmouth.
- 3 3 A modest access link makes sense but anything resembling a road is less desirable. The principle of the suggestion is a good one.
- 2 2 This would keep current facilities in situ without too much disruption.
- 2 2
- 1 1 This end of the town would benefit from regeneration and attract a younger clientele.
- 1 6
- 2 3 Concern over storage and club facilities. Our club is expanding and if we have new facilities will there be room for expansion.
- 1 1 Makes the area more accessible.
- 1 5 The position is awkward for lifeboat. It would slow it down, potentially causing loss of life.
- 2 2
- 1 Better storage for sailing club, cleaning up the existing site which for a prime seafront location is an eyesore. Improving existing space is much needed.
- 1 1
- 1 2
- 1 1
- 3 3 Neutral. Boats will find a way through the people just pedestrians etc.
- 1 1 Makes sense.
- 1 1 It's a small price to pay for a hopefully great facility.
- 1 2 Better public space and landscaping.

- 1 2 Better landscaping, especially around the Sid mouth.
- 1 2
- 1 Effective use of space for retaining existing storage and shop in the area. However, I have seen proposals for closing the turning circle and improving
- 2 traffic flow.
- 1 2 Only if it provides a scheme of architectural merit.
- 1 3 Access at present seems adequate.
- 2 2 Perhaps relocate the children's park to nearer the sea to include water activities.
- 1 Provided an alternative access is provided the turning circle can be dispensed with. Its incorporation into a pedestrianised area would more than
- 2 compensate for its loss.
- 1 3 I would need more detail. I'm not sure why this road is necessary, it would be better if we could do without it and re-use the space.
- 3 2
- 2 2
- 1 5 Concern for loss of public car parking facilities and location of fish shop.
- 2 5 Do not see any reason to change what is there already.
- 2 5 There is no requirement for change in this area.
- 2 Provision should be provided for vehicles to turn around at Port Royal. Perhaps the new access should be part of making a one way access in front of
- 4 the sailing club then around the car park.
- 1 I'm not happy with you stealing any part of the ham. There's already an area for maritime activities and storage which can continue to be used. I
- can't see how the fish shop can continue to operate while the building works are happening and I don't believe the new residents will want a fish
- 5 shop under their new flats.
- 2 As said in 7 I don't see the need to re-develop rather than refurbish and I think mixed use is a recipe for disaster. There are enough complaints
- 5 within the town re residents and commercial use and I can see restrictions on the use of facilities being imposed by the flat owners.
- 2 4 No development if the changes would affect the Ham in any way. This area was left to the residents of Sidmouth for their benefit.
- 2 5 Area E should be at the seafront in place of area A.
- 1 2
- 3

- 3 3 Depends on the design.
- 1 2 At the moment this area has a number of hotchpotch facilities. Better use of the space would be obtained by relocating some of them.
- 1 Service access would need to service any new facility from the rear but any extended access should not take land from the Ham greenspace or
- 2 2 footway. Parking spaces lost must be replaced locally.
- 1 3 The new proposed access road would clear out the fishing compound and destroy the towns fishing heritage.
- 2 6 Has some possibilities.
- 2 5 Massive traffic bottleneck. Access by sea will be worse. Stealing Ham.
- 2 3 Create traffic havoc! No thought to sea access. What is wrong with present landscaping? No thought to historic value and traditions.
- 3 5 On Ham covenant land. Reduces car parking spaces.
- 2 1 Because there will be better faculties down there.
- 3 3
- 3 5
- 2 2
- 1 2
- 3 2
- 1 Firstly, the part of area E, which incorporates the Ham recreational field is not a valid area to develop/ build on as there is a very large sewage tank below, which requires access. Secondly, the same (area 3) would mean losing 30-40 parking spaces which are often used by people using the swimming pool. and if any of the scoping committee cared to visit, it would be obvious that (through the summer months) this car park is nearly
- 4 4 always full!! Perhaps an access road is possible, whilst maintaining most of the parking, I have written a possible solution in the section 12 box.
- 1 2 More car parking / underground parking is required for the area.
- 1 1 In my mind the space available for marine activities and the publics use of the beaches and sea should be maximised.
- 1 2 It can only improve the area for the better.
- 2 3 Similar to answer to question 7, i.e. the views of those most affected (e.g. the fish shop owners) are the important ones.
- 1 1

1 2 Good access needed to the newly developed area.

1 3 cannot currently view

1 3

2 Vehicle access down past the Ham from Ham lane would spoil this area as a recreational area and entertainment area , not sufficient parking available now without encouraging more traffic into town. The fishing and maritime ancient area should as much as possible be preserved and protected. Sidmouth must not lose its ancient heritage and become another over developed town with a failing shopping area.... at present it is quite vibrant still .

2 2

3 5

3 5

2 5

1 2 Maritime activities are what count and this must be fully supported. The construction of the access point should be planned very carefully and this must not be a way to park vehicles not directly involved in activities connected with the sea.

2 5 Takes parking spaces, creates further traffic flow in pedestrian areas and changes maritime nature of area.

1 2 Current layout uses the space poorly.

2 2 We do not want to lose any part of the Ham

3 I haven't seen exactly what this would look like - but I don't currently like the mock up that is shown. Car traffic is already not massive in this area, and along with boats being pulled across this area, having a mixed use street makes the area more animated and appealing. It would be nice if boat storage could still front this area - as it breaks up the monotony of commercial/residential dwellings on the seafront. The existing layout of the sailing club is great - particularly thanks to the social/bar/food space, located on the second floor, which has beautiful sea views and provides a viewing point for the racing boats etc.. Giving up this entire area - to give all the residential units sea views would mean that the area would lose much valued public assets (i.e. indoor viewing platform) and a lot of it's character.

3 5 I have nothing to add to my overall view that people value this green space and are not crying out for change. There should be no encroachment on the Ham.

3 Car parking is a major issue in Sidmouth I would not wish there to be a nett loss in spaces. I do strongly agree that the turning circle should be pedestrianised but then where would the lifeboat turn? At the moment the odd car gets in the way of the tractor and trailer - a pedestrianised area would not be safely navigable (pushchairs, elderly, Motability scooters, wheelchairs, etc.). This again supports moving the lifeboat station towards Clifton Beach.

1 2

1 2 Would give more flexibility to the proposal by being able to use the presently used area more productively.

1 The whole area is exactly fine as it is. It is part of the attraction of Sidmouth. What will happen Folk Week. Can you afford to lose the revenue

2 5 generated by the event?

2 I agree that the public toilets and fish shop area should be part of this development, as should there be landscaping. However, this access road runs through the car park of the swimming pool and would therefore impact on the pool and reduce parking. This combined with plans to develop on the car park opposite are very worrying as Sidmouth suffers from a lack of parking as it is. Also this access road would potentially lead to more traffic in this area than we currently have with the turning point and I would be concerned on safety issues this could cause for families with young children

1 3 walking between the park and the seafront.

1 I can't really visualise what that area would look like, but it looks as if we would lose a lot of parking places if you have an access road over them and

1 4 I think that would be a problem.

1 2 Pedestrianisation of sea front is welcomed so an alternative access road is required.

1 1 I AGREE BECAUSE COMMUNITY SPACE IN THIS AREA IS VERY IMPORTANT. ANYTHING WILL BE BETTER THAN A HOTEL OR A TALL BLOCK OF FLATS

1 3 Do not think it will add much if anything to the plan. i.e. a waste of money

3 3

2 The turning circle must be retained - it is imperative that coaches and heavy vehicles are able to use it to turn rather than illegally reverse into One

1 5 Way Streets which they will be forced to do.

1 The wet fish shop is a fantastic resource but underused, in a better location with easier access it could well become a feature of Sidmouth and a

1 2 reason, along with the other improved facilities for people to visit the town.

1 1 The plan has to look at the whole area, I would like to see the area of the 'East beach / River mouth' included as well.

1 3 The views of people living locally should be more taken into account on this point

3 2

2 6 Not sure, what would happen to wet fish stall and storage areas in that area as they are used by local businesses.

2 This would create a road which cuts directly across the front of the swimming baths and separates it from it's car park. it also removes "Trawlers" from the area and relocates it where? to below the very expensive 5 storey flats? I think not.... The total plan is a mishmash, designed only to benefit

2 5 EDDC not the residents of Sidmouth nor it's visitors.

1 6

2 1 Will allow the area to be improved even more.

1 5 It seems sensible but to be honest I only think I saw one plan

1 2 A lot of problems at the turning area in the summer. Lots of people stop there to use the toilets or look at the cliffs and cause congestion.

The turnaround enables people to make a reconnaissance visit to the eastern end of the town. They don't necessarily want to get into the car parks or congest further the confined traffic system behind the seafront buildings. People will inevitably drive along the seafront to sightsee with or without the turnaround. They will then end up turning on the junction or through a car park. Many infirm people drive to the turnaround to see what's happening or visit the loos. People visit Port Royal under extreme weather conditions, when the spectacle of rough seas against the cliffs is a compelling sight - it may be thoroughly unpleasant if not dangerous to visit on foot.

1 5 Because we would lose parking spaces and parking in Sidmouth is severely restricted anyway and long stay is incredibly inconvenient if you are less than mobile. I'm not 'disabled' and don't qualify for a blue badge, but I am having a mobility issue that makes it difficult for me to climb the hill and use the long stay. By all means go ahead and lose parking spaces but we will need a park and ride that runs 363 days a year to encourage more people to use the town out of season. You need to think laterally. Introducing facilities for a load of hooray Henrys and housing that is not affordable for anyone except second home owners just creates an elitist and exclusive development that is no use to ordinary people. In the meantime you'll be driving people away from the town, and local independent businesses will suffer.

2 I see no issue with this area being incorporated into the redevelopment so long as the new road is clearly marked as a no through road to prevent queues and turning. Public car parking should be kept as much as possible as the town centre already struggles enough on busy days and during the summer.

1 3 Totally depends on the final development plans

3 2

1 Why should people have to move for an ugly 'enhancement' plan. Parking which is already dire could worsen. It has a quaintness to the area which could be preserved but tidied up. The drill hall could be refurbished to its original design.

2 5 We do not need any new access roads.

2 important to have access to fishing boats, part of Sidmouth's heritage BUT would it make more traffic in a circular manner for use by all traffic. that would not be good. BUT access needed to rear of proposed buildings.

2 3 I am unsure how this would affect local residents

2 Reasons are previously stated in Q7. It is crazy to locate the maritime activities further away from the seafront. N.B. in an emergency, this will cause life-threatening delays, as it will take longer e.g. to launch the lifeboat, to assemble crews etc. to "do" rescues etc. at sea. The loss of public car parking spaces must not be allowed.

2

5

4 I don't see any reason for changing it. Presumably E Devon Council think they could make some money out of it.

5 It's a conservation area & would be hugely disruptive.

I think that the redevelopment should include both areas E & D if possible to improve usability and make more attractive. Any access road must be made to have only occasional use only to avoid any impact on the pedestrianisation plans.

So, let's remove the facilities that are conveniently placed "on-site" and place them inconveniently "off-site" (with an access route to them) so we can fund an "improvement" of the facilities. And you do not see how bizarre that concept is? Get real. This about 30 flats, 30 flats, 30 flats, 30 flats...and thus huge amounts of profit for someone

The ham is not up for grabs - it belongs to everyone, no matter what inducements a developer may offer, the area would be denuded of its unique character if the alterations described at point 9 were allowed.

4 Reduced safety around ham park area for children

1 The more the area involves local business and enhances a bigger area the better

We disagree with the entire proposal of Any further development of the area other than restyling of the Drill Hall and improvements to the Car Park....thereby not paying money to developers and selling off land donated and owned by the residents of Sidmouth.

2

If this was possible without a 5 storey building it might not be so bad but 3 storeys if the absolute maximum that should be allowed. I recognise this will cut the number of homes but EDDC should never have planned that many for this space. They are reckless with our town. How will residents cope with Folk Week or is EDDC getting rid of that?

3 Unsure

3 Unsure

The Ham should not be changed and needs to be protected from development. It is used for many events and a 5 storey building must have an impact on light and the feeling of space.

4 Don't believe a new route is required

4

5 A new access road would mean loss of The Ham. See answer to question 7 re coaches.

5

- 3 4 Find it hard to visualise, but think the Ham is probably better as a Pedestrian Area only, especially as I think the children's play area should remain.
- 3 2 An access route with only occasional use would be much better than the current tendency of drivers to drive right to the end then turn round again.
- The Ham should be maintained for the free enjoyment of Sidmouth residents and visitors. It would be totally inappropriate to use a section of it as part of a boat park. The proposed new access route should not be provided – traffic should continue to be routed along the seafront to the turning circle. We cannot afford to lose up to 30 car parking spaces – at busy times, car parking spaces are already hard to find, and a lack of sufficient spaces would be likely to deter visitors, on whom Sidmouth depends. It may also be noted that we may already be losing weekend car parking spaces at the Knowle.
- 2 5 spaces at the Knowle.
- 1 3 Difficult to accept a access route without seeing the intended overall plan
- 1 1. This option appears to reduce the parking area and intrude on the Ham green space neither of which are desirable visually or environmentally. We need more parking near our shops to encourage use of local retailers and retention of a vibrant town centre which is becoming more unusual and is why people love Sidmouth.
- 2 5
- 2 5
- 3 5 The Ham needs to be kept as an open space, 'improvement' implies something else.
- 2 5 I disagree completely with the idea of this new development
- If the area is to be redeveloped it should ensure that there is a good 'flow' so that a new access route would allow this. Is it possible to incorporate the wet fish shop within the development? There could be limited retail options as well as providing for the lifeboat and watersports clubs which would draw more people into the area.
- 1 1 Better use of the area
- 1 2
- 1 6
- 3 5 Vehicular access in any form would be a waste of space in the area that should be used more productively for the public good.
- 1 I do not live near this area so I am unsure of the new access road effect on local residents. However, better access would be required if new development goes ahead.
- 3 3
- The area is currently popular as it is. It is part of old Sidmouth. Why would you want to change it? You could perhaps spend a little money sprucing the area up but NO changes.
- 2 3 It is too early in the process/insufficient detail to form a firm view
- 3

1 4 I fear for the future of the Folkweek Festival if any of the Ham land is utilised since the marquee and catering facilities occupy much of the area.

It is difficult to say exactly as the proposal/maps are not alongside the questionnaire, but I understood in the proposal that not using the turning circle would be a 'good thing'. With the proposed access to the back of the large development and parking/utility areas the turning circle becomes a

5 2 way highway, round a sharp bend, where vehicles could travel a lot faster than they can at present to negotiate the existing end of the prom.

2 It is important to look after the existing businesses and provide storage while providing an attractive pedestrian route to the seafront.

3

1 It is too early to say - see Qu 12 below - the design needs to consider the site opportunities as a whole not just assume the big block on the sea front must be accommodated.

6

3 Not really possible to comment without more detail

2 This area appears to be at least part of the Ham which is a useful open green space by the riverside, which should be kept intact. Is it not also a bequest for the town ?, intended for the public's use, not for building.

1 I do not agree that any of the ham grass area should be used for a road. if it could be routed through part of the fish shop grounds and not the Ham that would be OK.

3 Worthwhile only if it enables the seafront east of Ham Lane to be pedestrianised. Any such new access should be pedestrian priority, and for authorised vehicles only - not accessible to vehicles in general. The loss of green space should be minimised - I do not see why such a large area is shown as being needed, on Board 3

3 have not actually looked at the plans!

3 a - I'm totally against part of the Ham being stolen for this proposed development. b- The existing area for maritime activities & storage should be kept and renovated if necessary. c - this would be a massive building project and this will result in the fish shop having to close for ages. by the time it can reopen it risks it going out of business. d - the rich people who will buy these sea view flats will not want a fish shop there, it will be bought out by an expensive boutique in no time.

2 this access road would encourage motor boats being pulled by large cars and more traffic going through the ford . there would need to be one way traffic through the ford. the access road would bring in more traffic. service vehicles only and any boat user would need to manually take their boat to the jetty so as to discourage large , noisy motor boats. difficult to "police" this access road. need to have storage place for local fishermen but could prove problematic if other users from outside Sid mouth wanted to share the space. also I don't want cycles on the seafront promenade.

3

1
2 There is a lot of wasted space with the old buildings where the fish shop is and in the turning circle. A road through there to a more useful space for boat storage would be a good idea. As long as its not built on, and used for boat storage so the whole area isn't closed off this would look nice and be very practical.

3
4 You can't use land which belongs to Charity no 300967 for anything but the purposes stated in its governing document. Therefore those advocating this are asking people to agree to an illegal action. It doesn't matter how much people would like some of these things they can not be allowed to take place. Even the access road would contravene the requirement for free access and recreation for all visitors and inhabitants of Sidmouth, not just a sub-section.

3

2

4

3

3
4 A new access route would probably impinge on The Ham and the popular walk from the end of the Byes, over the Ford and through to the seafront via Port Royal. The Ham recreational area is key to several fixed events throughout the year and this should be put in jeopardy.

3
6 Access routes should be down to what the current users of the site (Lifeboat, Sailing club etc.) want, the people of Sidmouth who have been in situ for a long time.

2
5 The Ham is under a covenant as a recreation area and should NOT be used for any new route, except possibly an improved pedestrian/cycle path. It belongs to the people of Sidmouth and should not be built on or concreted over.

2
5 As I have said as answer to 7. This proposal would actually spoil the frontage of our lovely town, we do not need this proposal, and except for an overall update of The Drill Hall, it should stay as it is. This whole idea is for monies to be made by Developers, and overall it will not benefit the residents of Sidmouth, who love the Town as it is. Also the questionnaire is very badly written, the questions are loaded. " So far our research is showing private homes would be needed....to make the development possible financially... All these homes would become holiday homes, which would be empty for much of the year, not the affordable homes this area could benefit from.

1
5 Taking a new route as indicated would eliminate valuable parking area which the town needs to maintain it's very obvious attraction to visitors and residents using the town and waterfront. The town cannot afford to lose parking areas for the sake of more buildings.

3
5 The public space would not be improved as the new 'proposal' which of course you now say isn't a 'proposal' would use land that was left to the town for use by the residents. The whole proposal (sorry) is flawed. The consultants have either been misled or are incompetent. How can they, the town council and EDDC only give the public one option to consider?

presumably this will give vehicular access to the 'residents ' as no others could use it. no . you cannot relocate the path of the lifeboat nor provide
5 boat parking at the end of it. Just a cynical idea to get parking for the dreadful idea of 5 -story carbuncle!

2
2
5 It would make more traffic which means more pollution plus it would also spoil the open space.

2
2
5 More traffic.

2
3 This may be useful but needs to be thought through properly as there is a need for parking spaces to be available for Sidmouth Lifeboat Crew when
3 they are called to a 'Shout' and access is a necessity.

3
2
5 It only "could" but would probably be abandoned as soon as the finances were difficult.

2
2
5

2
2
5 I am against anything which prevents the current turning circle being altered

2
2
4 I don't think the overall road-system should change. See comment to question 7.

3
5 The area behind the current buildings is free of traffic and a pleasant place to spend time - bringing any traffic in that way would take away that and
5 reduce the amount of green space which is utilised by many Sidmouth residents, visitors, the Folk festival plus many other community events

3
2
3 As I don't agree with your plan, the access route is immaterial at this point in time but should be examined when a final plan is agreed.

3
1
3

1
2
5 This new development would engulf the old Sidmouth that visitors love. It would be unlikely to offer any benefits and the feeling of space would be
5 lost due to the 5 storey building blocking the views and Sidmouth's unique features would be gone. All over England you can buy fish in a fish shop
5 but in very few places can you buy it on the sea front only metres from the fishing boats. You would lose all the much needed parking spaces.

2
3
5 I totally disagree with the notion of taking more land for the relocation of maritime activities, possible relocation of the wet fish shop and storage
5 requirements; this would be an unwanted, unnecessary idea if it leads to demolition of the Drill Hall to provide expensive residential flats, 5 storeys
5 high!

3
1
4

1
1
1

1
2
5 It's important to retain the heritage and connection to the sea that (Removed DPA) fish shop provides. I don't think it's clear from the exhibition that
5 this development does provide improved public space and the addition of the access road creates problems with traffic entering the area - either via
5 the esplanade and High St or through the ford and the small road that connects with the Ham. This project needs to be thought about alongside a
5 traffic management plan and an integrated proposal which looks at this area alongside others in the town. Without that development will be
5 piecemeal and not strategic with a future vision in mind. Whatever we do now has to be well thought out and future proofed.

2 5 Again unnecessary, if the buildings were retained as they are no special access routes are required.

2 5 The proposed development would bring far more cars to the area and the new road would mean losing part of the Ham green space

These proposals do not enhance the area; nor do they offer the type of 'multi-functional facility' which the public would like as expressed in the responses to the NP questionnaire. I cannot support the proposals for the following reasons: 1) They eat further into the Ham area - which the Covenant protects anyway. 2) We do not need the 'relocation of marine activities and storage requirements': they are perfectly adequate as they now stand. 3) EDDC cannot determine a 'possible relocation of the wet fish shop' because this is part of the Ham Covenant - which is overseen by the STC; and very few residents and visitors would want it to be 'relocated' anyway. 4) 'Better landscaping' will not happen if a 5-storey building

5 blocks views from the Ham to the sea

1 5 Not suitable for the area

2 5 It is not a good idea.

2 5 We drive or walk along the prom almost every day. The layout as it is ideal for viewing the beach and cliffs.

I thought this wasn't a proposal so that would seem to me to be a long way off yet. You have failed, for example, to mention any restrictions to that taking place such as land ownership, SW Water, Devon Highways, problems with the turning circle.

1 5 This would mean developing Ham charity land.

The existing road layout allows for traffic to use the Ham turning circle if the reported illegal parking were properly curbed. The wet fish shop is the final illustration of Sidmouth's history as a fishing town - see (Removed DPA).

2 5 I totally disagree with taking more land for the relocation of maritime activities. No building should be nearer the seafront than at present. This would be an unwanted, unnecessary idea if it leads to demolition of the Drill hall to provide expensive residential flats.

3 It is unclear from Board 3 whether vehicle access would still be possible along Ham Lane from the Esplanade. If not, and the only access to Port Royal is via the ford and York Street, this would be impractical and unacceptable. Closing the Esplanade to general traffic in front of the development, would however be beneficial to users (Sailing Club, Gig Club, Sea Angling Club and particularly to the Lifeboat, especially during emergencies). We find it disturbing that any reference to the 'wet fish shop' is couched in very doubtful terms. The family who run the fish shop are part of Sidmouth's history, and an integral part of the activities in this area, and should be given more recognition, and assurance that they will be accommodated in any plans. Any loss of green space, even just what would seem to be the tip of The Ham, will possibly cause resentment. This area is much used during Folk Week.

3 5 The fish shop should remain where it is and an opportunity created to enhance the fishermen's shed area, this could be linked to the Drill Hall as a community venue, with upgrades to the other maritime activities. The public space needs improving, with toilets provided but streamlined to take up less area. A more innovative approach through partnership funding rather than reliance on expensive homes to sell to pay for the development

must be properly researched as the next step. A more innovative approach to providing up to 30 homes could provide solutions through raised apartments (i.e. as happens in other places and which overcomes the flood risk constraints) using the large car park - retaining residence and town centre car parking underneath. Looking at options for homes back to back or in a linear formation near to existing homes could be considered. A much more integrated look at access needs to be considered as this route alone would create more problems and congestion due to the narrowness of the road to the river but the incorporation of the turning circle to create a public area could be a welcome part of that solution. The storage requirements are integral to the whole area of the maritime activities. The whole Port Royal area needs to be considered not simply looking to provide homes on the sea front - this area should be dedicated to the community and for activities that support tourism.

Question 9 - Totally Unacceptable

- 2 5 there is no 'better landscaping' involved, only shrinkage of landscape.
2 5
- 1 3 Can't see the board and feel need to cut down vehicle access and parking in this area.
It is unclear why the former boat park beyond the children's play park is no longer used for boat storage but still requires significant maintenance. The Ham should be preserved and not built upon. I am very concerned that EDDC will have the covenants on the land removed so they can press ahead with their deeply unpopular plans. We do not need another 'complex' that totally lacks individuality and is poor value.
2 5
1 2
- 1 6 EDDC describe this area as their land but the public paid for it.
The area currently feels relatively quiet from cars, adding another access route would possibly intrude on this. How does the fish shop owner feel about being relocated? You are in danger of making it look like other seaside towns...once you lose its original character it will NEVER be regained.
- 1 5 see section 12
- 2 5 Dangerous and not needed
- 2 5 As above. Directly effect residents negatively
- 3 2 the area needs some thing to make it more attractive
- 1 2 Turning circle seems to be a waste of valuable space
- 1 5 The Ham should be left untouched - it is used by many many people throughout the year - it is an excellent 'Open Space' and must be left as such.
1 5

Q10a Board 3 shows the pedestrianisation of the Esplanade, shown as B, from the junction with Ham Lane through the existing turning circle to the east of the existing toilet block. How much do you agree or disagree with this pedestrianisation?

Q10b Please tell us the reasons for your answer to question 10:

- 1 Traffic is irrelevant in the turning circle area.
- 1 Why not build over the car park (flats) and keep seafront for leisure use.
- 1 The current turning circle by the Ham encourages many cars to drive to the end of the Esplanade where they cause congestion and park illegally, sometimes causing problems for boat users.
- 1 More space for clubs. No need to have cars turning down to have a look at the sea, this causes congestion and it would be a much better atmosphere for users of this end of the seafront.
- 1 Any pedestrianisation of this area must take into consideration the present use by coaches turning. Also vehicles shouldn't be encouraged to use Esplanade with junction from Fore Street.
- 3 A necessary inclusion of other plans agreed.
- 2 It is a popular area which many people visit but it is presently hazardous for pedestrians.
- 1 Agree as long as there is no loss of car parking or Ham open space.
- 2

2 Agree assuming there is space for a turning circle or easy route for turning round for people who come to see the seafront and cliffs.

3

cars, vans etc. need to turn and a roundabout at the top of Ham Lane would be too steep. If placed where the lifeboat currently is that would mean less area for the sailing club and for apartments.

5

I wouldn't want the access route to restrict an imaginative, landmark development.

3

A combination of pedestrianisation and a single land road might be a better option. Boat owners would need access to the slipway, and the sailing and gig club need to get their boats out.

2

This would improve the area. However, access for launching of boats must be maintained.

1

5

Pedestrianisation is good. Provide more I say. Infrastructure needs to be in place asap so this can be extended (park and ride, cycle paths, hopper bus extended etc.).

1

This would complete a walk along the Esplanade and lead to a safe area away from the car parks. The existing fish shop could be accommodated alongside the fishing boats.

1

1

2 Safer for tourists.

2

While the possibility of having more outside dining / drinking spaces nearer the seafront is appealing there would still be a need for vehicular access for those of limited mobility / using Sidmouth Hopper.

2

It could provide a unique area for seafront cafes / bars / restaurants to use for outdoor dining.

1

1 Because it would allow turning circle and adjacent areas to be turned into café / restaurants / bars / shopping area.

1

Would very much like to see the opportunity being taken to pedestrianise part of the Esplanade, possibly as a first step towards pedestrianising all of it.

1

Currently causing problems as motorists park to look at the cliffs! (Deleted DPA). Pedestrianisation would enhance safety / ease congestion and blocking access for lifeboat / gigs.

1

5 Not necessary.

2

- 1 No point on having a dead end. The reason people need it for turning is that visitors don't realise it's a dead end!
- 1 Quite a dangerous area for pedestrians. On the other hand if people who drive along the seafront cannot turn but are re-directed up lane won't this lead to congestion?
- 3
- 1 The area is valuable tourist space which is currently wasted on unnecessary traffic movements.
- 1 Some form of vehicle access is necessary. Current access better than new access through 'C'.
- 4
- 2 Makes sense.
- 2 be nice to have pedestrianised part.
- 2
- 1 Could make better use of that space. It's a dead end in all senses!
- 1
- 2
- 3 Arguments for both but I have no preference.
- 3
- 2 It will improve safety if the area is to attract more people.
- 2
- 5 Think the existing turning circle is required.
- 3
- 1 Restricted vehicle access = more scope for pedestrianisation, seating (e.g. coffee shops) and general community activities.
- 1
- 2
- 1 Pedestrianisation of small section could improve possibility of café culture, relaxation and enhanced use of the amenity.
- 1
- 2 Foot access important.
- 2
- 1 No brainer, blindingly obvious. But a redesign of Ham Lane and therefore the ham car parks will be required.
- 1
- 2 Would like to see this area pedestrianised please. This needs to be constructed with an ecological focus and an environmental carbon neutral focus.
- 2
- 3
- 1 It would make a safe area to view the view.
- 1
- 4 It is very important access for boats, would need to be looked at very carefully.

3 Pedestrianisation is always a good idea, will residents like this.

1 Keeps emergency access free for lifeboats etc. but also a safe space for pedestrians.

5 It prevents easy access to the beach.

1 Safer, better public facility to add to the Ham.

1 Current turning circle, even with parking restrictions, is all too often used for people to park up, use the toilets or look at the latest cliff falls to the east of Port Royal! This causes traffic congestion and is often dangerous for the people who are passing through the area from the bridge, the Ham green space and the seafront.

1

0

1 Definite, pedestrianise the whole seafront if possible.

1 Cars don't need the area and they take up too much space.

1 Cars often park there needlessly. Encourage people to walk.

1 This eliminates cars from the eastern end of the seafront.

1 Wholly pedestrianised areas lacking in Sidmouth. This area could be only for people.

1 Would like to see plaza type area.

1 Pedestrianisation is attractive, encourages people to stay in an area longer and browse the environs.

2 Service access still needed for boat launch and fish shop.

2 There is no reason for vehicular access except for the fish shop, could access from the Ham car park.

1 So many vehicles drive along and simply turn around because it goes nowhere.

1 The aim must be to reduce vehicular movement within the Port Royal area. This should be part of a Traffic Management Plan which is desperately needed for the whole town.

2 There is a safety issue at the moment as drivers don't anticipate the problems of getting boats over the road from the slipways.

1 Provided an alternative turning facility is provided this would improve a pedestrian only facility. From an initial observation it would be possible (subject to survey) to provide a similar sized turning area at the junction of York Street East Street by amending the entrances to the Ham, car park and that at the rear of the swimming pool.

1

2
2
5
5
4
5
5
5
5
1
1
1
1
1
1
1
0
5
3
1
1
2

However access needs to be retained to the sailing club and fishing boat park.

The pedestrian facilities and routes already present are more than adequate.

The existing Esplanade provides adequate pedestrianisation.

Some pedestrian priority should be planned for and accommodate special events, provided alternative turning provision can be accommodated.

I'm happy with pedestrianising the turning circle, but there is already pedestrianised access to the swimming pool and the esplanade which doesn't need to be changed.

The turning circle allows access to the fish shop and allows drivers to return along the front rather than being forced back into town. How about a 20mph order on the front and a controlled crossing instead of the zebra crossing. I think these are better proposals.

Again this would encroach on land left to Sidmouth residents. Pedestrianisation of the esplanade means difficulty for access for cars to car parks and to hotels.

If area E is moved to replace area A the pedestrianisation of area B would be sensible in that the movement of boats etc. would be safe from traffic.

The fewer vehicles, with their air and noise pollution, the better.

More pedestrian / cycle open spaces are needed in Sidmouth, in keeping with designs in the towns in the UK and abroad.

Chance to make this area the most attractive and vibrant part of the seafront with appeal to younger visitors.

Improved pedestrian space, seating and café plaza.

This is a road to nowhere and is a waste of public space. Closing this area would provide a more flexible recreational space and provide a focal point for the seafront. Traffic could be limited to access only.

Has some possibilities.

Massive traffic bottleneck. Access by sea will be worse. Stealing Ham.

Why does everything need to be pedestrianised! Another theme park? Cause traffic havoc? Will lose public toilets?

Still need traffic access / manoeuvrability to and through car park.

Always better to have pedestrianisation along the seafront and less cars.

5 Leave it as it is. The sea runs straight up the ramp onto the turning circle in bad weather. This would make it worse

2

3

A pedestrianised area would certainly encourage families to use the facilities, however, on the map Area B shows the road being cut off at the Western side of the road (not the side with the current Lifeboat House), surely this would give no access to the car parks.

2

5

In my mind the space available for marine activities and the public's use of the beaches and sea should be maximised - I believe this will support that approach.

1

If the area becomes pedestrianised you could end up having the area just as it is now, dead and lifeless

3

2

1

4

Sidmouth will be enhanced by more regard for the pedestrian and less the motor car

1

At present the turning circle is hardly used with a circular route being provided by going past the swimming pool. This area from my understanding is only used when people need to quickly pop to the loo.

1

3

1

2

5

Non essential vehicles MUST be kept away from Port Royal at all costs to allow for public access on foot and for safety reasons.

1

As I don't agree with 9 vehicular access to ham etc. would still be needed

5

The access should be for people and vehicles needing to use the area, not a turning point for cars cruising the sea front.

2

2

- 4 As above comment.
- 4 This begs the whole question of access and that depends on what is eventually developed here but in principle, I support increased pedestrianisation.
- 1 I do strongly agree that the turning circle should be pedestrianised but then where would the lifeboat turn? At the moment the odd car gets in the way of the tractor and trailer - a pedestrianised area would not be safely navigable (pushchairs, elderly, Motability scooters, wheelchairs, etc.). This again supports moving the lifeboat station towards Clifton Beach.
- 1 No reason.
- 3 It's perfectly fine as it is. Where will large vehicles such as coaches turn around after dropping off hotel guests?
- 5 Tend to agree if this area if this area will be properly landscaped and designated for the right kind of use. Cafe tables and a seated social area would be nice, if the sea-gull problem is sorted out. However if this is going to be a blank paved space with no element of street sculpture/beauty, no social area and a free for all then I wouldn't be in support. I don't think the turning area is a big issue as it is, it isn't used by cars that much and doesn't seem to pose a safety risk.
- 2 The lifeboat, sailing boats and gigs (both local and visiting) will all need vehicular access to this area so it would be difficult to make that part of The Esplanade entirely pedestrianised which will lead to confusion and danger for pedestrians who may wander out in front of vehicles.
- 4 Safer for pedestrians particularly if more facilities on sea front.
- 1
- 1 Think this will improve the area. Too many cars just go up for 'a ride round' and it can be dangerous at times!
- 2
- 3 The Turning Circle must be retained.
- 5 This is a fantastic idea, it will transform that end of the town. Together with a family friendly restaurant, spilling tables out into the pedestrian area, it could give the town a positively Mediterranean feel on a summer evening.
- 1 It not clear from the plan exactly who the highway arrangements would work. Is Ham Lane to be still accessible from the Esplanade, If not how will vehicles turn?
- 2 Please see comments under Q.9
- 3
- 1
- 3

5 it's a waste of time, the pavement at present is quite sufficient except when visitors park cars on it to admire the view. how would pedestrianizing it improve the traffic flow which you have now created through the swimming baths car park? It's ludicrous...

5

6

1 Seafronts should be pedestrianized where possible, as it gives people a better experience of the area.

1

2 People who need to use the area will surely be able to still move their transport, however at the moment I am sure there are people who just drive up their to see what is there and really going by foot is the best

2

2

5 The main aim should be to tidy up and make useable the drill hall and to tidy other buildings as necessary. Forget the 30 dwellings - in the light of Environment Agency flood grading, a mistake.

5

3 It's not the most important concern, is it?

3

1 There is no need for vehicle access to this area so long as the Sailing Club and Lifeboat station are accessible in the redevelopment. The turning circle is unnecessary and often creates traffic jams as drivers believe it to be a through road or want somewhere to pull up on the front.

1

2

2

4 People of Sidmouth have enjoyed a slow drive along the prom as a 'given' forever and a day. This takes place by many of the tradespeople early in the morning before a day's work. On returning from a holiday a drive along the prom to check the sea is still there is a must for many people. Why deny these simple pleasures to people. Also it is useful to decant children, pushchairs, beach equipment before one family member going off to park.

4

5 The route is sufficient as it is.

5

2 turning circle does get blocked by cars waiting on double yellow lines for folks in toilets etc. and dropping off families using Ham play field. better if this can be done behind the frontage

2

5 I feel the current road is enjoyed by visitors

5

5 Not necessary. Could be dangerous and life threatening, if in emergency, an ambulance is delayed/ has to take a longer route when collecting a patient in need It will also cause traffic problems + huge inconvenience etc. if the turning circle part of the esplanade is not available for vehicles for e.g. delivery vans to hotels on the sea front, taxi's and cars bringing/collecting visitors + their luggage to and from hotels etc.

5

5

4 Pointless.

5

1 Need more car free areas near the front to create public space areas and to enable beachfront cafes/restaurants.

5 Gosh. The number of people that have been mown down by cars turning by the toilets must be, well, in the...scores.

5 It's fine now. The change is only suggested to facilitate this monstrosity of a development.

4 What about coaches that need to turn around that access the hotels?

1 I would prefer less cars not more

5

2

1 This would improve the whole area without doing anything else but access is required for sewage treatment works and the current fish shop not to mention events which occur on the Ham.

1 There needs to be turning possibilities somewhere.

1 There needs to be turning possibilities somewhere.

2 I don't agree with the proposed development but agree with pedestrianisation of the area.

4 I don't believe it needs to be pedestrianised - there isn't a great deal of traffic in that area. Plus I enjoy the opportunity to do my "lap" along the sea front in the car which I would no longer be able to do.

2

5 See answer to question 7.

5

3

1 I am all for any increase in pedestrianisation and this would make that end of the town a much more pleasant space.

5 This proposed pedestrianisation should not be implemented – traffic should continue to be routed along the seafront to the turning circle. We cannot afford to lose up to 30 car parking spaces – at busy times, car parking spaces are already hard to find, and a lack of sufficient spaces would be likely to deter visitors, on whom Sidmouth depends. The proposed pedestrian area would in any event be overshadowed by the proposed massive 5 storey building – we do not need the proposed pedestrian area – the current promenade for pedestrians is sufficiently wide.

2 It is very much used in this way now as very little traffic uses that section

Why would you make the existing "turnaround" pedestrianised and create traffic chaos around this area but then build a new road into the pedestrian area?? I am not in favour of building anything on the Ham green space as this is well used by residents and for our various festivals and events.

1 Pedestrian access is already adequate, the turning circle is used a lot, especially by visitors who do not know the layout of the town. If it is closed off then many vehicles will have to divert down Ham Lane and then out to Mill Street into the High Street or through the ford, neither route is suitable for increased traffic.

4 Any pedestrianisation is welcome

1 The turning circle is not necessary - there is no parking off the turning circle so vehicles just need to use other routes - getting rid of the turning circle will really allow the area to be opened up and improved and properly landscaped.

1

1

1 Seems unnecessary.

3

The movement of traffic in this area needs some careful management and the councils aim should be to limit traffic movement in this area. The whole promenade area is not well suited to mixed traffic and pedestrian movement in the summer months.

2

2 It should already be pedestrianised in my opinion.

5 what effect would this have on the hotels and residential properties, parking, turning etc.?

5

6 see answer above

6

1 In my opinion excluding vehicles would make visiting this area a much more pleasant experience .

1

I do not understand how an area can become pedestrianised if at the same time you are proposing an access to areas to be used by activities and storage.

2

1 Removing the turning circle for cars would provide an attractive and safe area for pedestrians.

1

2

3 It is too early to say - see Qu 12 below

3

1
2
3
2
1
3
4
3
1
2
4
2
4
3
2
6

Less vehicle traffic on any part of the Esplanade is desirable.

The seafront is Sidmouth's main attraction, and at present is made unpleasant and dangerous by a constant stream of vehicles. Ideally I would like to see the entire seafront being pedestrianised. Failing this, consideration should be given to making the road accessible only to vehicles owned by people living or having businesses along the seafront . This could operate like the ZTLs (zones of limited traffic) in many of Italy's town centres, where pedestrians greatly outnumber vehicles and have right of way, vehicles proceed at a walking pace and space-sharing seems to work well.

a - I'm only in agreement with the turning circle being pedestrianised b - there is already pedestrianised access to the swimming pool so this development brings no new benefit. The only change appears to be a rerouting through the proposed maritime storage site and I already totally disagree with that eating into the Ham area c - there is already pedestrianised access along the esplanade so this development brings no benefit some restrictions would be needed for cyclists. on a Sunday one can make allowance for children and bikes but generally bikes and pedestrians don't mix.

I envisage something like in Lyme in front of the royal standard, where people can wander have a drink or something to eat and actually see boats stored. After all we are a sea faring town. Its a big part of Sidmouth.

Pedestrianisation with access seems a good compromise.

The Sidmouth herald says that the turning circle is needed for coaches dropping of at hotels.

By pedestrianizing the whole area it makes the unloading of boats and water sports gear problematic.

I tend to agree although given the current problems for coaches I think this needs to be carefully thought t rough.

Pedestrian walkways are always useful hence don't know/unsure it comes down to what is best for current users Lifeboat, fish shop, leisure centre - certainly easy access to toilet facilities are always an essential priority in Sidmouth.

If there is no turning circle for vehicles, people will not be able to drop off boats to be launched, or people with wheelchairs for strolls along the esplanade. Large coaches which currently use it after dropping people off will have to reverse up the one way street - as seen to be a problem for the police already in the Sidmouth Herald this week!

4

Part of the Town could be pedestrianized without all these proposals, involving lots of money being spent. Loosing the turning circle means that coaches will have to back down a one way street. Also it would mean that anyone like myself would not be able to drop off a kayak, or indeed drop off a sailing dingy or wheelchair. There would be no where to drop off any gear, sailing wet suits boots life jackets etc. This idea has not been thought through at all.

5

There is no need to establish further pedestrian area at the Port Royal end. There is already sufficient walkway for pedestrians along the Esplanade and the pavement. I believe this idea to be an unnecessary additional cost to the redevelopment plans.

5

5

so many visitors, residents, lorries, coaches make use of this. its loss would be detrimental to all and to the function of the esplanade

5

It wouldn't spoil anything.

3

There are already paths.

5

At present it can cause problems when Sidmouth Lifeboat needs to be launched, & the only other requirement for access is for people to launch sailing dinghies & fishing boats. There is no need for other vehicles which is what seems to happen, as they want to look at the cliff falls without getting out of their cars. If car park sign was put on the post pointing towards The Ham that might also be useful.

2

The turning circle is very useful for tourists, who are not fully aware of the area, and to rely on the "back streets" as major thoroughfares would be incomprehensible.

4

5

The ability to drive along the seafront, and back, gives, and has given, pleasure to countless tens of thousands of people.

5

It is good for visitors and residents to be able to see the sea from their cars, and would make life difficult for launching boat, which I think should still be from the present position.

5

It would be nice to pedestrianise it but the proposed alternative is far worse

4

That turning circle is a necessary part of vehicular use of the promenade. Only this week, in the Sidmouth Herald, police have pointed out the consequences for coaches used by the hotels on the sea front when this turning circle is rendered unusable by inconsiderate motorists.

5

2

I don't mind the Esplanade becoming pedestrianized but if the price to pay for it means that I have to accept the whole development of the area then it is a price not worth paying.

4

Pedestrianisation of the Esplanade east of the Lifeboat station would not inhibit launching of the lifeboat and gives the opportunity of fully integrating the Drill Hall and Sailing club into a sympathetic development that's not too gross for the seafront. No building should be nearer the sea than at present; i.e. not encroaching on land that is currently roadway.

1

2

1

During folk week this area is closed to vehicles and it provides a much better experience for pedestrians - locals and tourists alike. It make the area seem like more of a destination and a place where you don't have to share the beautiful environment with cars and other transport.

1

Again, pedestrianisation is already fine if the buildings remain as they are.

5

The overall effect will be increased traffic and more tarmac which outweighs the benefit of pedestrianisation. Also valuable parking will be lost

5

I'd be in favour of more pedestrianisation by limiting the turning circle - but not by taking out further slices of the Ham.

5

Not suitable for the area

5

This will push traffic onto York street and up to the ford these roads won't be able to cope cause traffic jams. There is not room for a round about at York street junction. A shared surface at port royal may reduce traffic speed to improve pedestrian safety and use,

5

If it isn't broke don't mend it. Let's keep our uniqueness please. Traffic made to go down York street will cause traffic jams.

5

As above.

2

To let people enjoy the area more.

1

See above. A drive along the esplanade and back, using the Ham turning circle is many visitors' first exploration of Sidmouth and should be encouraged.

5

5

See above re traffic. Marshalling people to clear the area during Lifeboat emergencies could pose problems. While this is still a road, and not pedestrianised, people tend to keep out of the way on the Esplanade. For comparison, driving from the Market Place through the pedestrianised area to the Esplanade, can be challenging.

2

However - this needs to be linked with an integrated look at the access overall with the wider town and cannot be seen in isolation given the entry and exit points to the sea front being limited. There would need to be service access to the pedestrian area but in principle creating an area at Port Royal which draws people to it, is linked to the Bays and to the Ham and provides a loop back to the town centre through the heart of the area would be welcome. The option presented would not fulfil this, however establishing principles that could then be used to develop a range of innovative options would be welcome.

2

Question 10 - Totally Unacceptable

There is no good argument to support this development at all. The entire principal is wrong and should be abandoned. The allocation of housing in the local plan should be placed where they fit into the local historic landscape (away from the sea front)

5

5

This would cause a massive disruption to traffic due to the removal of the turning circle - as such the existing turning circle does not cause any particular disruption to pedestrians.

5

I think pedestrian access is much more important than vehicle access and parking . Especially as walking is much healthier and better for the environment.

1

The problem with this question is that it is loaded. If one agrees with pedestrianisation, then it will be argued that you need to built a 5 storey building to finance the engineering required. You will subsequently state that you are 'systems thinkers', and were only acting on what the public said they want. This is a distortion of the facts. This is a very poorly constructed survey in terms of 'systems thinking' 'you said.. we did'. It is a highly biased survey that does not allow for complete comment.

4

We absolutely need to get traffic off the sea front and make it a pedestrian only zone. At the moment it is ridiculous.

1

6

see section 12

1

Drown ham lane in traffic

5

3

will encourage visitors and locals to utilise the area more

2

Good idea cutting down volume of traffic and would make the area more people friendly

2

3

2

Q11 To what extent do you agree or disagree with possibly losing some or all of these public car parking spaces to allow the Port Royal development to happen?

2
4
1
1
3
4
2
5
2
2
5
2
4
1
5
3
2
2

Q14 Which age group do you fall into?

6
5
4
3
5
4
6
6
5
6
6
6
4
5
6
6
6
5

3
6
4
5
2
2
5
5
1
5
2
4
5
5
1
5
2
2
2
5
3
2
3
2

5
4
5
5
0
5
6
5
5
6
6
4
3
4
4
4
5
5
5
4
6
4
4
4

2	6
5	4
5	5
5	6
2	5
2	3
3	4
4	4
5	1
2	3
4	5
2	4
1	2
5	4
1	2
1	2
2	6
1	6
2	5
1	5
5	5
4	5
2	4

1
3
5
4
5
5
5
5
5
5
5
5
5
1
1
5
5
2
0
5
3
5
4
5

6
5
6
6
0
4
4
5
5
6
6
6
6
5
5
5
5
6
5
4
0
3
5

5
3
4
4
5
2

4
2
4
4
2
2
5
5
5
5
4
5
1
3
3
2

4
4
1
3
4
5
6
6
6
1
6
5
1
5
2
3
4
6
5
5
6
1
5

5
2
5
5
4
2
2
4
5
2
1
4
5
5
5
5
1
1
2
3
5
5
2

3
3
5
2
4
6
6
6
5
5
4
4
4
4
5
5
4
3
5
4
5
4
1

5
4
5
5
2
5
5
5
5
5

5
5
5
2
5
1
5
4
4
5
5
5

5
5
5
5
6
4
6

5
3
5

1
3
4
5

5
5
5
3
3
6

5
5
5
3
5
5
5
5
5
5
2
3
3
5
4
3
5
3
3
3
5
2
3
3

4
5
6
5
6
5
4
3
5
4
5
6
6
5
5
4
5
6
6
5
5
3
5

3
4
5
4
3
4
5
1
2
5
5
4
1
5
2
5
5
5
5
5
5
5
4
5
5

2
5
6
6
5
5
4
5
4
5
6

3
3
5

5
6
2
4
6
1
2

5
4
5
5
5
5
1
5
5
5
4
4
5
5
5
5
5
5
5
3
5
5
5

5
5
5
5
5
4
5
6
6
5
4
2
4
4
4
4
4
1
2
6
3
5
6
5

	4
	5
2	
2	4
5	4
5	1
	6
1	1
5	4
1	4
4	4
5	
5	5
5	2
5	6
2	4
2	5
5	3
5	5

Q12 Any other comments on the Port Royal development opportunities?

Park and ride (bike or bus) is an essential element of all developments to Sidmouth town.

New development should be no higher than Trinity Court. Why not build over car park with mix of affordable / private apartments.

A harbour would be nice but realise that would be unrealistic. However, a jetty or decent ramp would be greatly beneficial, especially for launching in less clement weather then maybe the Gig Club wouldn't feel it necessary to relocate a boat to Lyme Regis for winter rowing.

Can we have a harbour and pontoon / jetty for launching and / or swimming.

Overall, an interesting and exciting proposal but I am concerned re the environmental impact of 30 apartments.

I was surprised to see proposed allotments there. They would invite vandals I fear.

Any development that affects the eastwards vista by extending beyond the present footprint or height should be resisted. The present southwards vista should be maintained.

We must keep the ham car park. New homes must be for permanent residents not as second or holiday homes. Could the fish shop be given more prominence. No more coffee shops needed in Sidmouth. No more shops like Seasalt needed in Sidmouth.

I think it would be good to develop a small harbour and breakwater. Not only would this be an attraction but would serve the local fishermen and yachtsmen. The breakwater would protect the cliffs from further erosion.

Before this is even started the Drill Hall should be demolished, together with all except one of the fishermen's sheds to provide more car parking which is in short supply. Toilets must be built in any new development. There must be no jetty built as this would interfere with the longshore drift as the rock groynes have shown as being the sole cause of no shingle to the east of the river and therefore adds to the increase of cliff falls.

Go for it! Be bold and brave. This must be a high quality, imaginative landmark development.

Parking in Sidmouth is at a premium already, and to lose spaces would be an issue. Manor Road car park is under used, a lot of locals regard it as being too far to walk into town, maybe a shuttle bus would help. Port Royal is an area that does need developing, but it must be done sympathetically and in keeping with the rest of the town and the regular users of Port Royal must be catered for. (Deleted DPA) it is fair to say that the town has got quieter over the last 18 months. A lot of local residents don't shop or even visit the town because of parking issues and the fact that they think there is nothing in town for them. We are lucky to have a wide variety of independent shops but the town is crying out for a decent restaurant / food outlet not a coffee shop which would also encourage younger people. Maybe unlimited parking on the high street or reduced car park rates after 3pm would help.

It is vital that the development does not inadvertently lead to higher costs to the water based clubs already in Port Royal. This would discourage membership and use of the new area. Similarly provision of a restaurant should not impact on the social facilities currently on offer (e.g. bar etc.)

Over development of the area. Loss of turning area on seafront.

Also the lifeboat facility. It would be interesting to see a number of alternative and less grandiose ideas costed in comparison, and all the funding possibilities explored without the need for 5 storeys and luxury apartments for absent owners. This area would lend itself to a much lower key and far less costly approach to improvement to

match Sidmouth's style. It could be a real attraction at that end of the prom - in fact, by pedestrianisation and widening the approach from the Esplanade / turning circle it would become part of the Ham. Any new buildings, or improved old buildings, lower than the proposed, say two or three floors. With the final building finishing no further east than the existing Drill hall. The whole area could be made as attractive as Connaught Gardens - what a draw for visitors!

The area could provide good facilities for both town and visitors. I appreciate that the sailing club and lifeboat share facilities but in a new building a lift would have to be provided to take people up to club and function level. I think that moving the lifeboat station along to the west side of the Esplanade where the RIB launches would be a very good solution, which could have its own facilities built in.

Can't come soon enough

Any development should not impinge on the space needed to house the marquee / bar / eateries for Folk Week and other festivals using the Ham site.

I see no reason to fund the sailing club / gig club or other watersports users. By all means use the upper floors for residential purposes, but use those funds for the benefit of all residents and to attract visitors to the town. Sidmouth Lifeboat launch from the western end of town - locate then nearer this end maybe in Manor Road car park. Moving them would give more room for shops, restaurants etc. Reduce the number of residential units, there's no absolute requirement that they be located here. Find another site in town to take these. Think bigger. This area is an ideal site for a more elaborate development including new retail units as well as restaurants / bars / cafes. It would provide lots of maritime facilities and plenty for bystanders to watch when they look out to sea.

The question about 5 storeys is the wrong question - incredibly narrow!!!! There are far more important considerations before this question, unless all you are doing is designing a building? The lifeboat is launched from the other end of the Esplanade so should go down there. What we need is a harbour with not only boating but eating / drinking / shopping facilities. Not convinced the new homes are necessary there, seems to have been accepted as a diktat simply because someone put it in the Local Plan as a possible. Why not decide what we want and then figure out how we pay for it - this is Sidmouth after all! This questionnaire / study seems to be confined to how to develop one building (the allocated site) and in no way a vision for Port Royal development. As such it restricts / ignores just about everything which could make Port Royal special! For example curve said building(s) in an arc across the space to the river creating a seating area for the restaurants / bars etc. looking out on a harbour! Extremely disappointing approach!! I had hoped there would finally be a vision for Port Royal (as per last year's architect competition).

Don't disagree with the kind of development proposed but disagree with it being up to 5 storeys high - would support a maximum of 4 storeys high. The lifeboat would be better based at the west end of seafront. The Port Royal area badly needs redevelopment with high quality buildings and facilities that will improve the area whilst enabling continued maritime and community use of the area. High rise beyond 4 storeys would be out of keeping and detrimental to the seafront. The Drill Hall in particular is redundant and dilapidated and should be demolished as part of any redevelopment.

Currently various bodies offering facilities development grants e.g. Sport England. A joint analysis of these for rowing, sailing etc. might achieve funds to reduce costs of project slightly. Some sort of sea wall or groyne extension to give launching protection would be very helpful.

Further residential accommodation is not required. The local clinics cannot cope with existing demand. The area could and should be invested in and used fully for the benefit of locals and visitors alike. There is something comforting about 'the old'. The new is always brash and featureless with no spirit or atmosphere. The sailing club just needs a coat of paint.

Lifeboat should go on Jacobs Ladder beach. Why not build homes on and north of the Ham and make current proposal high rise building site all community open space.

I didn't like the Board 4 showing the potential elevation. I know it was simply an illustration but was concerned about the height in relation to the existing buildings on the seafront.

Not enough parking already at Christmas and all through Summer months. Lost too much already to swimming pool. Sidmouth has managed to maintain its attractiveness to visitors by retaining its unique character. We must be very careful not to become another clone in the name of progress and profit.

The possibility of developing the land currently used as car parking between the swimming pool and rear of the Lifeboat should be examined for say Mews style residences. Loss of parking spaces could be recovered by putting a second deck on part of the main car park behind Trinity Court.

Don't spoil Sidmouth! 5 storey building here would stick out like a sore thumb. Existing trawler yard etc. has some charm, a bit of the town's genuine fishing heritage (only bit left). Any development should await installation of new beach defences. Cliffs are eroding so fast that the whole of the proposed development area is likely to look quite different in a short time from now and require rethinking because of flood risks etc.

Do not reduce car parking, visitors will end up clogging up residents streets and residents will have nowhere to park!! I would strongly retain the Drill Hall as it is of historical significance. A lot of other buildings in Sidmouth make it the quirky town that it is. Destroying the Drill Hall would leave emptiness in what is sea heritage in Sidmouth. The modernised hall could function as explained in section 7 of this form.

Strongly opposed to the idea of building on the car park which is a flood zone. How would occupants get insurance? Also car park is very well used and needed. The whole Port Royal area could be so much nicer, more vibrant and encourage tourism with better facilities.

Too few parking spaces are available now and this may deter visitors / shoppers to the town.

The maritime legacy must be retained. We must retain our heritage to pass onto future generations and not pander to the baby boomer generation. Sailing club (mixed clubs) is essential and lifeboat essential.

New launch facilities at the east end would require protective groynes (or similar) much as has been provided at the western end.

Board 4 shows a very tall building. I understand the need for housing and therefore funds to develop Port Royal. However, the diagram / representation shows an almost obliteration of the views up Salcombe Hill from the Esplanade. If the building were to be a few meters back then maybe this problem would be alleviated.

Should be 4 floors maximum, 3 if ground floor facilities are tall. Carefully designed block of 4 storeys with retail / café style areas on ground floor would enhance the area. Increase the possibilities of local amenity on the seafront as pedestrianised area to encourage strolling and sitting. If pier were able to be incorporated could be better still.

Residential development may not be required so Q4 is a loaded question. Probably perhaps but definitely not necessarily required. There is no reason why parking spaces should be lost. The Ham car parks need to be redesigned as part of a long term comprehensive parking plan for Sidmouth. Not difficult! This proposal is a good first step, the quality of the site needs to be recognised and emphasised.

Why can't you develop just the footprint in cubic form (and no higher) of the Drill Hall, no need to go to the expense of all the rest. We'll be in debt for a generation (if not more) thanks to the selfishness and gross incompetence of EDDCs plans to move to Honiton and Exmouth. Why can't they 'cut their coat according to their cloth' and stop living in la la land with big airs and graces.

Due to the avaricious mind set of EDDC and the Town Council to make a buck at the expense of what is best for the seafront I think that the Drill Hall alone should be developed, no higher or bigger than to create a community space focused on the sea, the people and the future. Not the prolific pilfering tendencies of bureaucrats in windowless offices surviving on espresso.

Losing parking is not too bad but the homes should not be flats on the front, that is not about providing local affordable housing. Smaller houses around the back would be more sensible, where they used to be! I do not agree that we should depend on buildings flats above to deliver this. I think it should be a community driven gradual improvement that allows the clubs and activities to grow. They are encouraging so many young people to get into watersports and I believe this development would restrict that. The Ham, including the northern section was given for informal public recreation and should be protected for this. The views are the essence of Sidmouth. The view along the Esplanade, the view from the ham to the sea to Core Hill and the view from the cliff down to the area would be ruined. This area was always known as the fishermen's beach and should retain this character. Sidmouth would regret a development of seafront flats forever, it would be wasting our most important asset.

Concern about the height of the development. From the drawing you can no longer see the hill, this attracts people and looks a bit like Seaton! Concern that clubs will be squashed into an inadequate site. The existing clubs are noisy on certain days... races etc. Boats with masts are noisy too. Will we end up with resident complaining? If they are homeowners what powers do they have! Expansion of clubs is a concern, can it happen? School badge has the cliffs on it, that building backs onto that. Sidmouth has its own character, don't kill it off...

It would slow water activities down. Boat owners would complain about the sailing clubs horn (which is vital) and the swimmers, dogs etc.

If flats no higher than existing apartment block on the other side of ham Lane, then marginally ok. Disagree with losing any parking, unless it's an absolute deal breaker. We should not lose sight of the overall benefit to the town of having adequate town centre parking for an older population and for all visitors / tourists. Any development needs to keep in mind the annual use of the Ham green space as the key hub for Sidmouth Folkweek. This attracts an extra 60-70,000 people for 10 days-14 days in late July / early August and is the major revenue contributor to many Sidmouth businesses which enables them to survive in the rest of the year. Any Port Royal residential development must recognise the right of the festival (Folkweek) to use the Ham area for Folkweek for this relatively short period each year.

Needs to be a community multi purpose space to benefit all year round use for visitors and residents.

Stop playing around and use some of the Ham and knock down and incorporate new swimming pool. It's wasted space and that way you could move it all slightly and not lose any car parking spaces. Move lifeboat to far end of beach (where it launches from) freeing up some more space.

Would be good to see another level of parking in the larger parking space - either above or below ground.

Any new buildings need to be designed with consideration of the existing buildings e.g. no taller and not just blocks. The frontage along the Sid needs to be improved as a walkway along the whole site.

Trying to squeeze as much accommodation into the area to the detriment of design is not acceptable.

Architecture must be sympathetic to surrounding buildings. Make full use of land afforded by construction at below ground level where possible. This is the most desirable site up for development on the entire Jurassic Coast. We should imagine an exciting, visionary use of space for community and visitors.

Put more public car parking underground. Alma Bridge - consider access and enhance visually.

The Port Royal improvements seem premature and the beach management plan (BMP) needs to be seen to be adequate prior to this. The East Beach needs protection, improvement and then could be used to enhance Sidmouth's holiday claims.

Focus of the space needs to be around the young people who have limited rainy day facilities in the town. Encourage local businesses rather than corporate.

Relocate Sidmouth Lifeboat to the west end of the esplanade. The aim must be to provide a communal area as traffic free as possible. The residential aspect must be strictly controlled. Given Sidmouth's history as a fishing village, capital could be made of this as part of the town's tourist offer. If as part of the development a jetty could be provided this would enhance the offer. Although there is a perceived flooding risk this should not be allowed to de-rail the process. This has been a much examined initiative may it come to fruition this time.

I can't see where the boat park is going - it needs to have space for dinghies with masts up so it couldn't be on the ground floor of a building. The crows nest (race control) needs to be high up (as it is at present). I would like to see Sidmouth providing more affordable housing, somewhere, somehow. We need to do our bit for the country whilst there is such a dire need. If the proposed Port Royal development is not affordable housing then I would like to see it linked to same that is.

It is essential that at least 6 disabled parking spaces are maintained at the front of the swimming pool. Maximum car parking in the town centre is essential to the survival of the shops and other facilities. Park and ride is no use to elderly people wanting to shop in the town. If any car parking is lost due to the development, the developer must upfront provide and pay for a single additional parking deck above 2/3 of the ham car park on the southern side, where the level is slightly lower. This would replace any losses and provide much needed additional spaces.

I'm not happy that 30 apartment properties are proposed for this area. Sidmouth is congested enough already - this should be a wholly community based area for the leisure enjoyment of residents and visitors.

Retain the fish shop. There are more than enough food outlets already, don't need any more. Port Royal is a fundamentally important area to the nature and character of Sidmouth. Any proposed development should be opened up for imaginative ideas for improvement. The current proposals for a 5 storey apartment block is totally inappropriate for the area! It would dominate the skyline and open Ham fields and create demands for car parking and other facilities at the expense of the public at large. Fundamentally we question the need for development of the type and size and would prefer that the council concentrate on improving facilities for the lifeboat, sailing and gig club and boating fraternity.

Although you address this as a small site 30 apartments would need at least 30 car parking spaces. The car parks in question are used by locals and visitors in large numbers. To take away these parking facilities to local businesses, shops and the swimming pool seems madness.

30 car park spaces would be allocated to the apartments, thus losing existing car parking! The whole scheme seems a money making private venture disguised as a proposal to improve what already exists. Why can't the council regenerate the area without selling off their assets to private companies, who want to develop only for profit.

The existing uses at Port Royal should take priority over other uses. In view of possible flooding either from the river and sea or both, any development should not be allowed to compound or restrict the flow of water as it could result in the lower levels of the town being flooded.

I totally object to the proposed development which will ruin Port Royal. The only people who will benefit are the people who buy the posh flats, and I suspect those people will not be locals. Sidmouth needs affordable housing for local people and doesn't need to be on the seafront. This huge development will cause a lot of disruption which will have a bad impact on tourism and Sidmouth can't afford to lose a single car parking space.

I think that this consultation is a wasted opportunity, particularly in the age of austerity. It's an opportunity to look to improve what is there at Port Royal and improve what our forbears have put in place rather than this slum clearance attitude which has not done well in the past. The same attitude that encourage EDDC to move! Port Royal is a community area and should be enhanced for the benefit of the community and not for speculators!

Before any development of Port Royal, the question of traffic management in Sidmouth must be addressed. The size of the proposed building is overwhelming and would visually detract from the seaside look of the area. No thought has been given to the fact that the sewage pumping station is adjacent. Surely 30 luxury flats is not addressing the problem of affordable and social housing in the area.

No thought has been given to building flats over car park (D) with two layers of parking below. This would raise the revenue needed to upgrade the facilities on the seafront without the need to build a monstrous building that would ruin Sidmouth seafront.

A new building on the front should be no more than 4 storeys high (the top one recessed) for visual reasons, not only from the beach but from inshore- and existing buildings should not be overshadowed. If 30 apartments really are vital for the scheme to be viable (which I doubt) the building should be extended north horizontally even if some car parking space is lost as a result.

Finance (or rather lack of it) is being used as an excuse for doing nothing and extending discussions and meetings. Hundreds of grants are available locally, regionally, central government, private etc. How do you think £6 million was raised to build 'Tornado', the first steam engine built for over 55 years. And now the Art Preservation Trust has already begun to build an even more expensive engine (a P2). Sidmouth needs one or more 'icons' e.g. a huge fountain, jetty, more sea transport along the coast. This would help tourism. NB a jetty not a pier! Small botanical garden in the presently wasted space on north side of the ham. A small 'performance hall'. Take a look at what Teignmouth has done with a grant of over £1,000,000 from the Costly and ? grant. An excellent small, multi purpose performance hall.

The lifeboat doesn't launch very often for real emergencies. When it is launched it takes too long to get it into the water. We have seen a distressed swimmer clamber out of the water whilst the lifeboat is still being tracted to the ramp. Is it really a viable service? On average it launches 12 times a year, four times this year so far for real situations (rather than practice runs).

No loss of existing short stay parking. Full parking standards for housing and food outlets. Lifeboat, when returning to storage uses turning circle and parks on the road (area shown as B. Remove lifeboat house to other end of seafront (near Belmont Hotel) so that launches are a lot quicker, otherwise, provide a direct access ramp from new lifeboat station into the sea. The new building should not be higher than the neighbouring building. Coaches leaving the Royal York and Faulkner Hotel also need to use turning circle. Move the gig club storage to the west end of the beach where they are used. Deck part of the Ham (west) car park. Please get rid of the existing eyesores - especially the Drill Hall!

The proposed 5 storey building is designed to maximise floor space and financial return from the sales of holiday flats. It fails to recognise the heritage value of the existing community assets such as the Drill Hall, fishing history, the Ham recreation common, w/c and shelter etc. There are other non three dimensional solutions which would be far more appropriate and in keeping with a conservation area and would provide a focal point destination for the resort.

Why so large! Why not just use Drill Hall. Why lose parking. Sidmouth does very nicely from hotels, don't spoil it. For a earn for EDDC.

Q4. What research? Where is the evidence? Re-develop and re-se what we have. Why do expensive apartments need to be built? 30 second homes? 30 unaffordable homes? Luxury ghettos? No chance for local people! Proposed building way too high. Overshadow / dominate the whole area. No thought. Any development should stipulate 'main residence only'. Q8 not if it becomes too expensive, question is misleading, not specific enough. Q11 why should new homes get precedence over parking? Locals first please! Totally OTT. Poor questionnaire. No thought to affordable housing. No thought to historic value. No thought to traffic chaos that it will create. No thought to size of development. No thought to precedence of present users. Token multi use facility. Height of proposal far too high. Dominate area. No thought to re-using what we have. Loss of Ham area / wet fish shop unacceptable! Re-use what we have. Sidmouth deserves better than this. Questionnaire raises more questions than answers.

There has been no consultation with those living in the area. The one proposal doesn't work. Whole consultation raises ongoing concerns about transparency of EDDC and STC.

You mention making parking available for new homes. HOW ABOUT MAKING PARKING AVAILABLE FOR EXISTING HOME OWNERS! There have already been flats built in Mill Street taking away valuable parking and garages once used by us and no extra parking allocated. Try making things available for existing local residents first! The only parking for us is Riverside, Hillside or Seafront. The council has already out priced the use parking in the private spaces.

Parking in sidmouth isn't great now let alone taking away more parking. If you make other parking to make up for the loss of that particular car park it would be fine. I strongly thing a public slipway should be put in for a: the lifeboat b: for the public and local angling clubs to use. (Like Lyme Regis and west bay) It will generate income over

years to make it maintain itself and bring income into Sidmouth. Annual ticket for launching is roughly £180. Wouldn't take long to get 100 boats launching. For little money spent doing it properly, wouldn't take long for it to start paying for itself. Not only will it bring lots of trade to Sidmouth and generate income to the lifeboat, and general shops, if done correctly, it could solve the big problem of the cliff erosion east of the river.

The area marked Area E on the map (East St car park) can NOT possibly be up for redevelopment (building) as it has already been stated that there may be parking losses to the South of the swimming pool. If the size of the building on the Drill Hall site was reduced in size, the area below (a good 10' below street level), could, with the proper supports, offer parking below said building. Whilst tidying the whole area, please consider issuing a compulsory order to remove the old diesel winches, and replace with a communal electric one. (Deleted DPA) I can only see this as being a good thing. Maybe the Lifeboat station could be moved nearer this side, with an improved launching ramp, possibly incorporating gates which could be shut in times of storms. Alternatively, could the Lifeboat be relocated to the western end of the Promenade where they currently launch, thus cutting down the response time due to eliminating the need to travel across the sea front? To sum up, I understand that some housing may be necessary to cover the cost of development, but please NOT 5 stories (this would be higher than the adjacent building and most along the front), and some provision should be made that these would NOT be holiday homes/ second homes. i.e.: fairly affordable, so as locals could be able to live there. Alternatively, a small national hotel chain (like Premier Inn or Travelodge) could be persuaded to have a small facility there? Hopefully someone will take the time to read all that is written here, of course, all development should be only done once a permanent solution to the beach/ cliff erosion and Alma Bridge have been sorted.

More parking is required. Not less. Current plans look as they will be a carbuncle on the landscape and spoil the esplanade rather than improve it! You need to think again and be more imaginative or leave it alone!

Having been contacted by local residents campaigning for the retention of Sidmouth's important drill hall, my concern is that yet another reminder of Britain's military heritage will be lost; many categories of redundant military structures defy re-use, but I gather your drill hall enjoys intensive use as a community space; I am also informed that its structure, particularly the roof is quite individual; (Deleted DPA). I know that many buildings still extant then have since been demolished; my feeling is that the efforts and sacrifice of countless volunteers in the TA and the Home Guard is insufficiently recognized and that whole chunks of recent history have been eradicated, often for no good reason; as memories fade new generations need to be reminded of local as well as national events.

The views of the present users of the affected area are of paramount importance in these discussions. Any loss of car parking space would need to be compensated for elsewhere.

There is not a lot of parking space in Sidmouth so to lose more spaces when you hope to encourage more visitors to come to these new facilities would be counterproductive.

Please develop something that Sidmouth can be proud of by embracing the heritage with a modern forward thinking design for the community. I recognise the developer will need to flats or shops to make the project viable but do it well !!. To many bad examples in Devon e.g. Exmouth Make your proposals and actions transparent to bring the town with you

I feel if there were money in the budget the swimming pool should go. Its is overcrowded and very dated now. People are already asking for the existing sports centre be moved way from joint usage with the school. Perhaps with the port royal development the relocating of the swimming pool into a better all in one sports centre would be of more use to the town and free up more space within the port royal development. I feel a more European feel should be introduced here with outdoor spaces to eat and drink as well as entertain. Small retail spaces to be used by pop up shops could also be incorporated.

As already said this seems a little thought through plan with little consideration for the local area 5 stories is too high and will look out of character, the river/sea frontage has not been used effectively and no consideration or plans for flooding or helping prevent cliff erosion at that end of town. The developers will make huge amounts of money at the expense of town residents with this development.

Car parking is difficult in Sidmouth and costly so to help with the parking problem faced by every town these days, a Park & Ride system should be introduced. Park & Ride works well in many other Devon towns all along the South coast why not here? People and vehicles do not mix well!

I am surprised by the proposals as I thought the scheme would flow from creating a maritime, fishing, coastal base e.g. Marina, hands on exhibition particularly for youngsters etc. but instead seems to be driven by a large multi purpose building. Surely only the drill hall and toilets need to be replaced by a much smaller building incorporating some residential, seafront cafe and toilets.

The current arrangements scream out for redevelopment. Let's go for it.

I think the area at the moment has character, new developments do not have character, neither do the residents of expensive apartments. This redevelopment will "kill" this area.

Anyone who advocates zero-change in this day and age is being unrealistic. On the other hand, intelligent, community-minded councillors would avoid change that destroyed what makes Sidmouth so special. In my opinion, there is no argument whatsoever for building a monstrosity that is out of keeping with the area, both architecturally and in size. Indeed, nothing has demonstrated that most users/visitors (local or otherwise) are crying out for massive change on this site. Improvements to the toilets and the bridge are required and it would be good to see greater pedestrianisation and perhaps a public performance area. It is also the case that the present buildings leave something to be desired. It should be possible to develop a parcel of land that does not encroach on the Ham with a building that is of an acceptable design and size, that would provide a home for existing users and that would fund these changes whilst enhancing the location. Any other approach brings into question the motivations of those forcing this through.

Please demolish the drill hall.

Thousands of visitors flock to Sidmouth every year because of its old fashioned charm. It is a town by the sea, not a seaside town. The historic Drill Hall needs to be retained and renovated so that it becomes an asset to the area. Properties are not required on the sea front as they will ruin the ambience. This kind of development would attract the kind of owners that would use them as holiday homes and there is already enough of those in town. Also, this kind of property would not be affordable by the majority of locals.

Parking is a major issue in Sidmouth. We should not be encouraging more cars to the seafront area with the introduction of residential properties. Losing any parking spaces in Sidmouth is a major and costly deal. I have before been unable to find parking and have just had to drive back home and give up on coming into the town. Any parking accommodated in this build should be for those using the new community facilities that should be provided in the space, because if this space is used successfully it will attract more users to the town and therefore more cars. No parking spaces should be lost through this development. We are already losing some spaces through the Knowle development and cannot afford to lose more.

There are enough problems with parking in Sidmouth without losing any more spaces - unless some more can be allocated elsewhere or by making the Ham car park D into a double storey car park. I strongly approve of removing all the buildings along the seafront from the lifeboat station around to the fish shop - they have all 'had their day' and there is nothing attractive about any of them. Good luck getting any change down there!!

Were are the replacement parking spaces to be provided if spaces are lost as 11 above? What are the flooding risks applicable to the proposed development?

Why are you hell bent on putting new homes in this area? They will become a set of second homes or holiday lets and will add nothing to the community.

There are not enough spaces in town now. any idea in getting rid of car spaces is a non starter!

I feel any development of this area should consider building facilities for both the lifeboat and sailing / rowing clubs should be built out to sea in some sort of a marina development. This would also improve our protection from the sea in this vulnerable area. Allowing a 5 storey development in an area that is occasionally partially flooded by the sea seems very irresponsible.

That end of town has desperately needed redeveloping for many years. I know that some people who live here are very attached to things as they are but if you look at that end of town in an objective way it looks awful, the drill hall is a derelict mess, the public toilets hideous, the sailing club is frankly ugly, and the turning circle is a pointless waste of space. In the main I strongly support the redevelopment. My only slight concern is that at 5 stories, the building might be one story too high. But if it needs to be that high to make the finances work then it would still support it. Perhaps make it as attractive as possible.

This plan should prioritise a jetty or ramp to enable small craft to access the water. The area of East Beach needs to be scoped at the same time even if this is for a 'phase two' of a larger plan. Much will be in the design of the proposed building, its vital to run a competition for an acceptable style of building - I feel the building proposed is to large for this setting, a smaller high quality building and access provision to allow boats to access the sea is favoured and would fit in with the Sidmouth that we know.

Why have you not asked for comments under Q. 4? What I "strongly disagree" with is the inclusion of up to 30 apartments and the up to 5 floors/height of the building - totally out of character for that part of the seafront. It is the mouth of a river after all!! If this large scale development happens, then I can see a Marina will be next and that, for me and quite probably thousands of others, WILL BE THE END OF SIDMOUTH AS WE KNOW IT (AND LOVE IT). As someone who lives in the West Midlands, which is no longer England (!), I feel YOU MUST REALISE THAT YOU HAVE A RESPONSIBILITY TO MAINTAIN AREAS SUCH AS SIDMOUTH FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS. That is why we

subscribe to the Sidmouth Herald newspaper every week to restore our faith that England does still exist!! I therefore feel that the basic plans for the site SHOULD be carried out WITHOUT the large scale residential use and should be funded out of local/national funds, wherever they can be accessed.

Please think long-term on this, we need to develop but not up to 5 storeys.....

If we take away car parking spaces would it mean that we would be encouraging out of town parking? And would we need that facility as it would only be needed during peak periods.

You should be concentrating on creating a mole and harbour/marina in front of the eastern cliffs which would serve several purposes, a) reduce erosion, b) give the Yacht club and "Trawlers" somewhere to relocate to, c) provide revenue from harbour fees, d) create a tourist attraction. e) free up space for the redevelopment of the ham with a new shopping/residential building in keeping with the remainder of the town and sea front. The proposed building will be a complete blot on the town.

I would like a proper harbour so the boats can remain in the water

I have no problem with the plans other than 1. 4 floors, really I am unsure, I was unable to look at this visually when it came to town, Have you got a picture to look at. 2. Taking the carpark south of the swimming pool will potentially cause a problem for people, however, I know this is hard for people to think about, but I really think people should walk or use public transport, as much as possible when going in to town, that's what we try to do. A period of illness meant I had to use a taxi. There is public parking to the north of the swimming pool, and it should be stated it is for swimming pool users only.

I strongly believe that the development should not be 5 stories as this will dominate the area and spoil the water front. We have worked hard to maintain the character of Sidmouth and this would destroy it.

The proposal as it stands is outrageous. The building is grossly excessive in proportions, architecturally very unimaginative and would blight the seafront forever. I recognise that this might not represent the final proposal but we start on the wrong footing if the EDDC is willing even to suggest such a monstrosity in this vital conservation area. We are considering a building which will either be enjoyed, endured or loathed for generations to come. Let not those generations look back in wonder and exasperation at what the planners approved. And let's not precipitate the possibility of any such eyesore happening by giving it the benefit of early consideration.

What sort of businesses will you have in the development? Have you considered the impact on existing businesses that have been here for a long time? All the time you develop one end of the prom you are pulling the central focus away from Church St, High Street and Old Fore Street. This development could actually be the nail in the coffin for many businesses struggling to survive in the current economic downturn. Does anyone actually consider how to revitalize the town as a whole? You might set this up, with considerable inconvenience to people while it is under construction, with local businesses losing money while the town is turned upside down, driving visitors away, and then these local businesses end up having to close. Will you offer existing businesses the chance to move into the new development with decent rent and rates? Have you considered a multi storey car park to help ease parking issues? That's something that would bring more visitors in. I think your plans are dull quite honestly, and of benefit to a very few people who can afford the facilities and accommodation, and I think my business will suffer greatly if you go ahead.

A redevelopment of Port Royal will be a fantastic investment for Sidmouth. The area is an eyesore and so any improvements will be better than its original state. New facilities will go down a treat especially with younger residents who are often overlooked due to the average age of the population and it may help to decrease anti social behaviour. Affordable restaurants would also benefit many residents who may be unable to afford the ever rising prices (and lowering standards) of some of the other

eateries in the town. I hope that the bridge leading to the cliff fall area of the beach will be looked at during the planning as any redevelopment of Port Royal will be a severe contrast to the condition of this area.

A paying park and ride would help enormously with public parking. As a resident it is very difficult to park and shop in town and I feel to lose spaces would not be popular with many residents

There is surely no need for housing other than to finance the scheme. Trinity house residents are going to be harmed by the development but only a small amount of the flats are permanent residents so perhaps you don't care. The rest of the flats are empty so why build more. We have plenty of food and drink outlets. Think of the old saying "if it isn't broke don't fix it". For a much smaller outlay this area could be given a facelift in a much more sympathetic way.

Sidmouth is a very unique town. I came to live here on the Esplanade for the beauty and unspoilt development. Like wise, visitors and locals alike want to keep it as it is. The Old Drill Hal should be kept and made into a museum or historical site. We do not need extra houses. Trinity Court already has over half empty un lived in flats. Already flooding is a major issue. Any large scale development could bring more flooding and sewage problems. Do not ruin the view of the Jurassic coast.

no more than 4 storeys high. buildings to reflect design and colouring of existing buildings - not something completely different. Car parking in Sidmouth is a nightmare, spaces in front of swimming pool probably need to be used for the new facility with some disabled spaces but no car parking should be taken away from behind the pool or the large ham car park, not under any circumstances.

I feel that the consultation process by including comments about financial viability and the production of 5 storey blueprints including residential housing may well be alienating many locals. I am unsure why a project to improve the area is not looking into all options on an equal footing including possibly the refurbishment of existing buildings rather than having to go for a taller building to incorporate private housing away from flood risk. If the only viability for this project was by private funding then it condemns this project to pressure/bias from the private home builder. I feel that an option at this stage would be to ask if people would prefer a smaller project based on local funding or a larger one that has to incorporate private housing and also the vehicles that would inevitably belong to the owners of these homes. I'm really at a loss as to why we would approach a development that would benefit the council, locals and visitors alike based on a "well you can't have it if you don't agree that we need the money to come from a private buyer!" ... how can we ever make the best neutral decision for the town?

Visually, it is an awful development. It is totally "out of place" with Sidmouth's sea-front "architecture" and appearance. The proposed ugly (and much too tall building) is being placed in a conservation area!! This development is "out of character", will completely ruin the currently beautiful, unique sea front. Importantly, it will cause dangerous problems re e.g. increased flood risk, sewage and cause additional dangerous damage re the current, precarious stability of the cliffs. This proposed, awful development must not be granted approval for the reasons stated and also, importantly, re the reduction/loss of public car parking spaces that this development will cause. Importantly, the historic Drill Hall must be restored and repaired asap, so that it can be used as a wonderful venue for many local/community/visitor etc. activities.

This is a once in a lifetime opportunity to invest in the seafront of regency Sidmouth. What is being proposed is a short term proposal based on profit. It will not endure or enhance the area. There needs to be far more imagination - do some beautiful.

I note that on the outline plan showing the preposterous proposed building, the current big car park has a description underneath the title which says 'Potential Development Opportunity subject to flood analysis'. What a ridiculous idea. Without the big car park, which is often full and must generate enormous revenue for EDDC, people will not come to Sidmouth. We have austerity measures at the moment but to sell this area now to developers (who the Council seem unable to control) to

generate instant cash, would be irreversible and in better times, the Councillors who agreed to this barking idea would be seen as fools. (Deleted DPA), I would have thought that any sane person would think twice about building flats on a flood plain next to the sea. In 50 years time, it is quite likely that the cliffs will have eroded back another 20 metres or more and the whole of that area will be inundated at high tides.

I fully understand the commercial requirements and other constraints but still feel that the development plan as it stands is a lost opportunity for the town. The opportunity to be creative and exciting in a seafront location is very rare. The plan as it stands seems to lack vision and the proposed building (understood to be outline) is very imposing, unexciting and brings very limited benefits to the town (unless you are in the sailing club!!). I strongly believe that a five storey building is too high, 30 apartments (with parking) is too many (the local plans states up to 30) and improvements in the sailing club facilities should largely be funded by them.

What is it about this development that has ANY plus points for ANY current resident? Want to drive to town in the summer to pick up a prescription at Boots? Well you now must park in the Manor Road car park because your parking space is now full of boats. Why? Because we really needed those 30 flats. How this development has got traction is beyond my understanding. What started as a decrepit Drill Hall has snowballed into a very greedy, short-sighted, and unrepresentative proposal that benefits NO-ONE in Sidmouth.

there are plenty of alternatives to this monstrosity of a development which leave the infrastructure intact AND enhanced AND with fully functional and improved facilities. I am horrified that these developers feel that they can bribe the town with such transparently unnecessary "enhancements" in return for taking land and parking which belong to the community. SHAME ON THEM AND SHAME ON EDDC for even considering it. It is horrific.

Parking is limited already in Sidmouth

Parking is important and the green area that the folk festival stage occupies on the Ham could be part time parking or multi use entertainment/car parking area depending on the season. I do not want to see a building over two stories as the classic view will be altered to the detriment. If homes are needed to make the scheme work build them into the roof on the third storey. This development should be a car free zone and exclusive to pedestrians only. I believe no homes should occupy the space. Move the lifeboat station and watersports and fishing shanty to where the life boat launches at Redcliffe walk. Make the scheme include a small harbour for boats to moor

This project is for the benefit of The EDDC (members?) and the developers and has nothing to do with improving our town. It follows the folly of the Knowle fiasco whereby EDDC now have to BORROW MONEY to see through their grand idea! Is the sale of the PORT ROYAL area helping to pay the interest on that loan...or for other reasons unbeknown to the residents?

Agree.....however, with greater expenditure - saved by not moving EDDC offices - underground car-parking could be provided.

We are terribly short of parking spaces as it is

Done properly this area could be a stunning development that would greatly improve Sidmouth. Look at the development at Fistral Beach in Cornwall or Falmouth Marina. At Maenporth in Cornwall there is a fabulous restaurant called the Cove, it has apartments above it, a really nice development which makes the most of the coastal view.

Done properly this area could be a stunning development that would greatly improve Sidmouth. Look at the development at Fistral Beach in Cornwall or Falmouth Marina. At Maenporth in Cornwall there is a fabulous restaurant called the Cove, it has apartments above it, a really nice development which makes the most of the coastal view.

The questions are geared to agree or disagree with the development. My answers would be different if it was a 2 storey building for the community as set out in previous advertised developments.

I particularly object to the prospect of a 5 storey building. Whilst housing may indeed need to be built to partially fund the redevelopment. I do wonder who will be buying sea fronted flats - local residents as affordable homes OR luxurious second homes!!!!

The site is meant for public use, not a development site. It was left, in good faith, to the people of Sidmouth - it was never intended to be built on in this manner. It will ruin the atmosphere and attraction of Sidmouth as a whole. It is unjustified, unfair and most definitely not in the public interest. The whole development would be out of keeping with existing buildings in the area. It would be a 'blot on the landscape', reduce tourism and tourist activity due to a changing image, steal business from High Street shops, have an impact on Folk Week activities which in turn would affect local businesses, some of which are already struggling.

The proposal for 5 stories appears to be due to trying to get 30 flats above the ground floor, when prior to the rethink on flood risk they could have been on all floors. It will result in an overbearing building spoiling the current views along the esplanade to Salcombe Hill, which currently trends downwards towards the Ham end, leaving a view of the cliffs from most of the esplanade. This will be spoiled by a huge building. It will repeat the mistake of Seaton with its big square block of flats in the centre of the seafront which is a blot on what might otherwise be a pleasant seaside prospect. The answer is fewer flats. The existing Ham area should be left for all to enjoy, as intended by the donors, and not divided into private areas, even if those are for sailing etc. use.

The proposed block of flats is too large for the proposed site in what I understand to be a conservation area. It would spoil the current views both inland and west along the coast, would require additional parking for residents and those using the other proposed facilities in the area. Given the location with sea and coastal views the flats are likely to be very expensive and only available to those rich enough to afford them and/or used only as second homes, of which there are plenty already. I would have thought there is a greater need for affordable social housing. Don't spoil a pleasant open space!!!!

If it means creating residential development, then leave it as it is, and just proceed with the pedestrianisation zone, which would only take a few bollards and signs.

The massive bulk of the proposed building at Port Royal would be disastrous for the look and feel of the seafront and the Ham. The view from the seafront at present shows the lifeboat station, sailing club and Drill Hall gradually tapering down to a view of the cliffs. By contrast, the height and size of the proposed new building would give a very hard finish to the seafront, would obscure part of the view of the cliffs, and would not fit in with the surrounding natural environment or existing buildings. Meanwhile, the Ham would be dominated by the height and shadow of the proposed building. The proposed building is in a Conservation Area, but what we are being offered is not conservation. We do not need 30 very expensive apartments, and we already have a lifeboat station and facilities for the sailing club and gig club. The best approach for Sidmouth would be to refurbish what is already there, and the land at Port Royal should continue to be used mainly for community benefit. The Drill Hall is a historic building which gives a link to Sidmouth's past, and thus it is important to Sidmouth. Although it has been neglected over recent years, it could and should be refurbished (possibly with grant aid) as an attractive and interesting building for community services / visitor services / small performance venue / café. Its historic interest would give extra appeal for visitors etc., and it would fit in well with other elements in the Conservation area. The information centre could also possibly find a more prominent location in the refurbished Drill Hall. The Lifeboat station is just what you would expect a traditional lifeboat station to look like – it is an attractive building which fits in well with the Conservation Area. And the Sailing club building appears well-suited to its purpose with boat park and viewing area looking out over the sea – again it looks right for a traditional Sailing club building and blends in well in the Conservation Area. All that the existing buildings need is some refurbishment where necessary, for which grant aid would hopefully be available. For the Drill Hall, a decision would be needed regarding the community services / visitor services / small performance venue /

café etc. to be located there. This would preserve the predominantly community use of this area. The fishing boats drawn up at the head of the beach currently add to the area's character and should be retained in that location, whilst the fishermen's sales area should also be retained. We cannot afford to lose public car parking spaces, and we surely do not want boats parked on the Ham. I understand that an 1896 Conveyance of the Ham land to Sidmouth Urban District Council required that the Ham should (under a charity) be for ever freely available to Sidmouth residents and visitors for recreation. Thus, as I understand it, the proposed use of part of the Ham for a boat park appears contrary to that conveyance and the terms of the charity. It seems that the proposed use of the land on which the toilet block stands may also be contrary to the Conveyance. It seems that the proposed new massive building could represent substantial harm to the Conservation Area, and to the setting of the Sidmouth coast, which is part of a World Heritage Site – unless there are substantial public benefits (which there are not), it seems that this may be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework (please see paras 132 and 133 of the NPPF in particular). And the proposed demolition of the Drill Hall, resulting in irretrievable loss of a historic building, could also represent substantial harm to the Conservation Area. When considering possible refurbishment of the Drill Hall, its current deteriorated state should not be taken into account as a negative factor (please see para 130 of the NPPF). It is not possible to think about Port Royal without expressing concern regarding the crumbling cliffs at Pennington Point. The proposed apartments are in a high flood-risk area, Flood Zone 3 – it seems quite inappropriate to be thinking of putting new residential development in this location, when the protection offered by the cliffs is under threat from years of inaction regarding the fact that the Eastern beach has disappeared. The proposed new massive building and associated changes for Port Royal represent the wrong plan – inappropriate for a Sidmouth Conservation Area – in the wrong place – Flood Zone 3, and with the protection offered by the cliffs under threat – and at the wrong time – the priority should be to reinstate the Eastern beach.

The council seem fixated on external funding through commercial development, please continue to pursue all other means for enhancement of the area

If there is money to spare then a focus on protecting our world heritage site must be top priority - also to secure the consultation area. There is already limited parking for residents in this area and adding 30 residences/60 cars to this is not sustainable. Sidmouth is thankfully a thriving town with a few areas that require regeneration. I would be interested to see how Urban Splash would revive this area (I don't have any connection with that company, just respect their ethos for not covering every available site with cheap modern residential property that gives developers profit without any benefit to local people, the environment or sustainability

I feel very strongly that residential development in this area is inappropriate. The Drill Hall should be retained and refurbished as a community hub and the Sailing Club and Lifeboat Station sensitively improved to make them more practical but retain the appearance at this end of our beautiful promenade. I feel very strongly that we must not lose any parking spaces and this is crucial. I have spoken to 2 people recently, one a local resident and the other a holidaymaker, who both left Sidmouth without visiting the town centre because they couldn't park!

I think this so called consultation is completely ill thought out. It is completely biased, in that we are expected to comment on a proposal for housing that the Council sees as 'needed' in funding the redevelopment, and 'to allow the improvements to facilities to happen' as worded in question 4. These are opinions, not facts. And only the opinion of the council, not other interested parties. The wording of this questionnaire is completely unfair. Unless someone is in full possession of the facts about Port Royal scoping study and the legal aspects of the Ham site, the answers are going to be skewed. Any professional questionnaire designer, as I once was, would be horrified at this so called consultation questionnaire. Question three leaves out so many other activities and there isn't enough space in the answer box to include them all.

This is an opportunity to make a real difference to this area of Sidmouth. The Drill Hall in particular is an eye sore and replacing will improve the look of Port Royal immeasurably. We can just stay as we are - and there is definitely a strong element locally who want to do that - or we can develop sensibly to make better use of the existing space, whilst retaining essential elements like the lifeboat station and the sailing club/watersports club facilities. Changing Port Royal is essential in my view and

these are sensible proposals. I am a little unsure about the need to have 5 storeys but if the 5th storey is set back I would support it as I accept that there is a need to have residential development to finance this proposal. A proper jetty would be a good idea too.

Although I appreciate the need for living accommodation I am concerned about the height of the proposed development. 5 stories is too high.

Not too high a new building . Need a jetty. Do not need to retain the Drill Hall which is an eyesore and should be demolished.

Any new developments need to be in character with the existing properties. Reducing parking on the town would just push cars further into residential streets.

I strongly disagree with the current proposal for developments at Port Royal. My feelings are that the building will be too obtrusive and will spoil our outstanding views from the beach and promenade. I understand that the project needs to raise finance in order to be completed. However, the last thing that Sidmouth needs are more apartments that will be empty for most of the year. Building holiday homes that in the current financial climate will be mainly purchased as investments by the wealthy who will most probably live outside the town and therefore make next to no contribution to the local economy. I have no idea how in the current climate this can ever come about, but any new housing here should be built as local authority managed housing for rental only (and never for sale). This would provide affordable housing for young people many of who might then be able to work in the town without the need for a long commute and parking spaces. I am very sold on ideas that suggest the current buildings should be renovated and reused for the community. We must move away from development that only benefits the haves.

You state that research has shown that residential homes are required for the development to go ahead. I would like to see more information regarding this research - facts, figures, who conducted the research, who gains from the large profits which will be made from seaside residential property etc. etc.

The suggested development is totally unnecessary . The idea of providing homes in this location is ludicrous. Obviously some will have sea views making them appealing as second homes to the wealthy. What use is this to the residents of Sidmouth? Use the empty property in town. Why can't the existing buildings be refurbished and put used by the public. This iconic area is just part of the esplanade that everyone loves. If the area were to be redeveloped in the monstrous way suggested, it would open the flood gates for marinas, noisy motor boats and jet ski's . Then, if you are lucky.... amusement arcades, candy floss, kiss me quick hats, bingo, donkeys on the beach!!!!!! All the things that you would love to hate. Why do you seem intent on destroying Sidmouth? It is one of the few truly towns by the sea remaining NOT a seaside town.

Normally we would have 1. establishment of the facts(scoping study)2. preparation of a strategy for consultation(the Neighbourhood Plan-not yet finalised)3.consultation on some options to meet requirements of 2. Your proposal seems to ignore stage 2 and to be developer driven - public good must prevail over a greedy rush for money. Whatever is done must stand the test of time as it will affect the appearance of Sidmouth for many years. The suggested massive building is totally out of proportion for the site. While good facilities must be provided(and improved)for present users it is essential that there is no encroachment on the open space held in trust for the public. Provision of public toilets essential for this end of promenade. Must ensure that developer makes significant contribution to erosion protection as site could otherwise be at risk. Why not use the larger carpark imaginatively-e.g. with a 3 level building(no higher than the adjacent flat block) to give two levels of much needed parking with retail/exhibition space/flats on top

You acknowledge it is a small site - 30 new homes with presumably at least 30 cars: how elitist is that - the general public who come into town to enjoy what it has to offer, and to support existing businesses and leisure activities will not be able to park so that owners and users of this new development have their private space. At busiest times (school holidays and fine weather at weekends) the town is already desperately short of car parking, and many people who wish to visit are elderly or with young families.

Overall I see no need for such a large development in order to 'tidy up' this area. A less ambitious, more modest approach should be sufficient to create modest improvements where necessary and maintain the atmosphere of the town that must already be one of the most vibrant and unique resorts in the West Country.

Putting a 5 story block on the seafront would compromise the views of the world heritage Jurassic coastline to the east. It would be too dominant alongside the other buildings on the esplanade. Having lived in Exmouth prior to moving to Sidmouth we think that not enough consideration was given to the scale of the Exmouth marina and the subsequent loss of outstanding views. Please do not make the same mistake in Sidmouth. We also think that it is very important, to the traders in town, that the large car park closest to the shopping streets is maintained.

Yes, this should not be just penthouse apartments with expensive restaurants. Sidmouth has enough of those already! Something more affordable for all.

Clearly the layout is a first concept design but it is very unimaginative. It appears to assume 30 homes are needed so plonks a big residential building down on the sea front and squashes in car parking, access and other uses round it. No doubt the sea-view apartments would be expensive and so might be bought as second homes - this seems to be what happened at the docks in Exmouth. More affordable housing back from the sea front would be more appropriate to re-generate the area on a sustainable basis. A five story building fronting the road would be monstrous, blocking view from the Ham to the sea and from the Esplanade to the east cliffs. In order to design a layout I think information is needed on whether: (1) there can be building on Ham and East Street car parks; and (2) the SWW pumping station site needs to be preserved as it is. Then a more dispersed design might be possible with housing on East Street and/or Ham car parks (on pillars with parking underneath if there is a flood risk) and a lower profile building closer to the sea front.

Cant see any improvements here. Same as we already have.

The eastern end of the Esplanade which lies within the area of these proposals is also included within the Sidmouth Town Centre conservation area. Given the historic value of Sidmouth it is extraordinary that there is no current assessment or management plan in place for the conservation area and in the absence of either of these it is perhaps difficult to assess these proposals properly. Although the consultation states that the Esplanade end of the study area lies within this conservation area, it makes no reference to the consideration of its special character within the proposals; this is most regrettable. Such lack of consideration undermines the validity of the exercise given the degree of change that is being proposed. The Devon Buildings Group considers that the character of this end of the Esplanade is very much bound up in the individual nature of the buildings which front it here - it is the point where the Esplanade changes from a formal continuous terrace to one of mixed uses and individual buildings oriented to the sea and separated by gaps. While none of these buildings [with the arguable exception of the Drill Hall] are individually of great merit, as a group they demarcate this area as one that serves other functions for the town than simple residential. If the proposal for a monolithic block is adopted then this character would be swept away to the detriment of the special nature of this part of the conservation area. Although the illustrations of the proposed development here are only illustrative, they demonstrate this effect clearly. Similarly they demonstrate that a large and high block would be a visual disaster.

While it is necessary to generate income from the proposed flats to finance the plan, it is essential not to overdevelop and spoil the character and views here. Three story building is probably maximum height to avoid this - or poss. at most 4 story for half the site, tapering down to 3 towards the river. If this means fewer flats and not enough funding then we must cut down on the entire plan if necessary. The style of the building again must reflect our local traditions and history - not a modern glass and concrete block please. I do not believe more shops are needed, nor a performance area.

I disagree with the basic premise of the proposals, that the 30 new homes allocated for this site in the Local Plan have to be on the sea frontage. This seems to directly lead to a building whose scale and massing are completely inappropriate, out of scale with neighbouring buildings, and which cuts off essential views of the cliffs from further west on the seafront. The site would be better left as it is than developed with such a massive building. If 30 homes have to be incorporated, they should be put on one of the existing car parks with parking below. The seafront should be kept for water-based and other public activities, which could be accommodated in a much smaller building. Furthermore, any homes built on the seafront would be likely to be high-cost holiday apartments, of no benefit to Sidmouth residents. I would like to see much more imaginative proposals using the whole of the site (except the Ham, which must be left as green space). Could the lifeboat station be re-located at the far end of the seafront, near where the boat is launched? There is no need to re-accommodate all existing users on this site, if an acceptable alternative can be found. Consideration needs to be given to an affordable rent for the fish shop if it is located in the new development, or perhaps cross subsidise its relocation to the High Street.

its all a matter of how rapidly is the general erosion of the cliffs and along the river is taking place and is redevelopment a waste of money? I need to read up and then I will complete another form before the 31st but definitely I want to see the drill hall pulled down and a new building to incorporate the sailing club and lifeboat area but keep the jetty as it is as it is quirky and rustic and say no to motor boats. if flats need to be built I am not sure if they will be insurable and some would need to be one bedroom apartments for single people over a certain age who are on the council waiting list as if you are having to work until you are seventy and are on the minimum wage then one cannot afford rents in Sid mouth and single people are not a priority for the council.

- I am totally opposed to this proposed development which seems to be a deliberate attempt to ruin Port Royal and Sidmouth. It's so awful I simply can't understand why it's even being proposed. - it seems to me that the only beneficiaries of the proposed

if flats are built then have no parking places for them . just a bin storage area and a bike space . they can park in the car parks or get a taxi or hired car!! single older people need affordable housing and with people working to an older age then one bedroomed apartments should be provided for single bods over a certain age because they are never a priority on the council housing list. at the end of the day it is all a matter of when is this area going to be flooded by the sea and a complete erosion of cliffs and river bank down to the ford? and is it going to a waste of money to redeveloped this area?

I would welcome any improvement to this area, as long as it is sympathetically done and in keeping with the style of Sidmouth. After all, that is what brings people to Sidmouth in the first place. Miller close off mill street is one such development that fits in perfectly well. Also there is quite a bit of wasted space and the end three buildings are very ugly. Sidmouth would definitely benefit, from this proposal. I don't think the building should be higher than the others on the esplanade as it would stand out too much, and definitely no social housing there. We need to maximise the potential here!

The boundaries of ED03 were wrongly drawn in the Local Plan, the toilet block is not available for redevelopment. It is part of Charity 300967 land, the Charity Commission say it is not suitable for 'land swap' under their regulations. The proposal is in a Conservation Area which according to the World Heritage Site documents is being relied on to give as much protection as a buffer zone would, if this doesn't turn out to be the case then we could have a buffer zone imposed. English Heritage have said that the Drill Hall is an asset to the Conservation area even though they can not list it because of the changes to the exterior. (Deleted DPA), believes the Drill Hall should be saved; and his opinion is greatly valued in the Heritage industry. (Deleted DPA) has said of the Drill Hall ' The hall is undoubtedly an important building, not only for its potential social uses but also because of its historic fabric. In particular, it has a wonderful hammerbeam roof. These kind of roofs are increasingly rare and this is a very fine example, referencing 14th and 15th-century roofs such as Westminster Hall and the Law library in Exeter in the form of its hammerbeams.' And finally EDDC officers themselves said in 2012 when a planning application was submitted for demolition ' It is conceded that the building is in a poor state of repair. No structural report has been produced to confirm its structural integrity and therefore there may be potential for its adaption and re-use. Policy 130 of the NPPF advocates that the condition of a heritage asset should not be taken into account in any decision if the cause has been deliberate neglect. The reasons for the condition of the building are not known but since it has not

been well-maintained in recent years should not necessarily be justification for its demolition. I would also advocate that evidence is presented to demonstrate that alternative uses have been sought and suitably dismissed. PROVISIONAL RECOMMENDATION – PROPOSAL UNACCEPTABLE unless a cogent case can be presented for demolition.” We are attempting to attract visitors by water as well as the current routes, the ferry currently can't land and so passes us by. If we manage to achieve this ambition the Port Royal needs to be a welcoming face. It is not a cul-de-sac at the end of the Esplanade and large buildings are not appropriate. Large buildings also cut off views, from the coastal path, from the Esplanade, from the hills and from the sea. Large buildings, replacing old but functional buildings with new and shutting the surrounding environment out are all old fashioned habits. Research published this year from many groups shows how wellbeing is tied to heritage and environment. In Sidmouth our economy is tied to it too. We need a space which draws in tourists so they spend money in the town. We do not need places for them to stay. We have hotels and other accommodation with spare capacity and although we have enjoyed a boom recently there are still plenty of properties for sale in Sidmouth. This area is a prime site for sensitive refurbishment to give something the future generations can be proud of. People, apart from architects, are rarely proud of blocks of flats. The competition entries for Re-Imagining Port Royal should inform these consultations. The winner (Deleted DPA) produced a refurbishment design they were confident would find funding for most of its elements, why has this been ignored? These comments are only indicative of my concerns and are not the whole of them.

See my comments on number 7. Refurbishment would be a lot cheaper than knocking it all down and starting again so it would be affordable.

There should be an absolute required that the building does not go taller than the adjacent buildings on the Esplanade. The recent Sid Valley planning consultation asked a question as to whether such a taller development should be allowed 'if done sympathetically'. These are weasel words: one person's sympathetically (usually the developer) is another person's eyesore (generally the public). The only way to effectively secure sympathetic building contours is to have an absolute ban on building higher than the adjacent buildings. A further point is that the proposed building, as illustrated, is a rather ugly, characterless modern monolith which would be a very poor addition to that end of the Esplanade, adjacent as it would be, to a magnificent Regency frontage. It would simply replace what is by any stretch of the imagination a bit of an eyesore at present, with a new monolithic eyesore - hardly a welcome change. The brief to the architects should be to provide a frontage that is in complete sympathy with the adjacent Esplanade frontages. Would it not be possible to sympathetically re-purpose the existing buildings. Finally, this site is a key part of the future heritage of our wonderful town, a town that has escaped many of the ravages heaped on towns of similar size by less imaginative planners and developers over the years. Whatever building is put there must have the future heritage value as its key driver. If this means that there cannot be 30 apartments, so be it. Let us keep to the Sidmouth practice of focussing on the architectural heritage and eschewing modern development ideas.

I feel strongly that the existing building could be improved and feel that a five story building would dominate the sea front and take away from the character of the area. I also feel strongly that The Ham area belongs to the community and should not become part of a development which may claim ownership and prevent access to the area in the future. It is important to secure the Ham as a local asset for the towns people and not let it become developed. We are very lucky to have access to this community asset and it should be looked after and improved for the community not put into private ownership.

I strongly oppose the idea of 30 apartments being incorporated into any new build at Port Royal. They will be holiday flats or apartments for the privileged few, not much needed affordable starter homes. Tenants of the flats above the new improved water sports facilities/restaurant will complain about noise like a handful of people living opposite the Ham play park do. This in turn will create restrictions on what the space can be used for. It is public space meant for the enjoyment and entertainment of the Sidmouth community don't make the mistake of 'privatizing' it. Port royal should also retain its very important fishing heritage so any redevelopment should be sympathetic to this and incorporate this strong historical element into any future plans. Make it a desirable location for all to enjoy. Also maybe lets look at the flood risk and the collapsing cliffs before investing millions into a 5 story high building which will also block so much light changing the sky line and view forever. Lets think outside the box develop something really unique!

It is key that any development should be for the benefit of Sidmouth not a money making exercise for EDDC. Sidmouth is a very special place for residents and visitors. We need to make changes only for their benefit. Many seaside towns have been spoilt by inappropriate development. I sincerely hope this will not happen to Sidmouth seafront. The proposed changes for The Knowle are bad enough. The Port Royal area is an eyesore and needs redevelopment but not at any cost.

I found the artists impression showing the height of the new development shocking. The view from along the esplanade to Salcombe Hill is a Sidmouth treasure and must not be lost by building such an intrusive over height building/s.

1. The building shown on the 'proposal' is far too high and too big. It should be no higher than the existing structures. That shown would ruin all the views of the cliffs and green hills behind from all directions and would be an eyesore. It is out of character for the town and the UNESCO shoreline. The proposed building would put the Ham into shade for most of the year. 5 storeys would completely dominate the historic esplanade. 2 I would prefer to see a simple refurbishment of the area, without adding housing or commercial developments. Grants and funding would be available within Sidmouth and from outside. 3. I would like to see the Drill hall repaired and put to new use as a community and visitor venue, perhaps with a balcony. The Hall is of great historic significance and there are few left in the whole country. It is part of Sidmouth's history. It could easily be adapted and provide some wet weather activities for visitors. 3. I do not want housing there - it would not be affordable and would simply become either holiday apartments or luxury apartments for more people from outside the town. Also the fact that the area is in a high flood risk area 3a makes it unsuitable for building on. The only people who would benefit would be developers. Any underground parking would flood. Any parking at the top would be an eyesore! 4. I want to retain the Ham green and playground - for the marquee in folk week, and other uses, such as seafest, picnics, occasional informal football, etc.. Its use could perhaps be increased for French or other markets and festivals through the year, but the covenant should be respected - it belongs to the people of Sidmouth and visitors for recreation. It should not be built on at all. Under what you have shown us 1/3rd of the grassed area would be lost - this is unacceptable. 5 I want to retain the swimming pool complex and car parking - as it stands it is sometimes difficult to find enough parking to go swimming or go to the seafront or sailing etc. Sea activities require lots of 'gear' so it's not practicable to arrive by bus on a park and ride or walk miles with life jackets, wet suits, paddles, etc.! And many people in Sidmouth cannot walk that far yet for health reasons need to access the pool. 6. It might be possible to make the sailing club look more attractive and put awnings over the boat park, but demolition and rebuilding are completely unnecessary. It's a great facility, reasonably priced and the club would need the race box and balcony at that height so that races etc. can be clearly seen and for safety reasons. My understanding is that the sailing club owns the building 9 though not the land) - if it was demolished would EDDC recompense us with new (as big or bigger) for old? 7. The 'proposal is completely out of scale with Sidmouth and out of feel. The large public toilets, fish shop, boat park etc. are all real assets which we do not want to lose. Nor do we want to lose the historic feel of that end of the town which relates to real activities. 8 The sailing club boat park needs to be adjacent to the club itself as now. 9 More could perhaps be made of the fish shop and fishing history of that end of the town. 10. the footprint shown on the plans trespasses on land which is not available - it incorrectly includes the toilet block building which is under covenant. It also comes out to the road at the front - whereas other buildings along the front are set back - not good! 11. The plan as it stands would provide WORSE facilities for locals with NO new facilities, no improvements - everyone loses except the developers. If that's the option, then we are FAR BETTER OFF just leaving things as they stand.

This questionnaire is particularly biased in favour of development and of the already made proposals. Opportunities for whom I ask ? The developers are the only people who will benefit from this scheme. Also The Ham area is already a flood zone, all this extra proposed concrete building would make the likely hood of flooding far greater

I hope and trust that the Council will listen to the local residents views and not accept proposals that are out-with the needs of the town and existing users of the area. (Deleted DPA). The area should be maintained for public facilities/entertainment with open spaces and should not be amalgamated with further dwellings. There are other areas of the valley that can be utilised to meet the Councils' residential building targets.

Really! Is this the best way to add to the Regency town? Higher than the Cliff, higher than the fine esplanade buildings, ugly, unimaginative and lacking in any visual suitability for its position. No consideration for the sense of position. What environmental effect will this block have on the easterly wind and water as it travels upriver compressed at the mouth? The town does not need any more empty winter holiday lets/ second homes.

It's ridiculous and would completely spoil Sidmouth and it's view.

It spoils Sidmouth completely! It gets rid of greenery that people play on and replaces it with road which can't be good for the environment. That greenery is used for the folk festival and it is a lot more fun to have grass than building.

The car park requirements are needed particularly during the summer when it is a lovely day, it then becomes a real problem with people driving round & round looking the spaces. I have even noticed people standing in a space waiting for the car, which maybe on the other car park to arrive, they will not let the space go to anyone else.

Why is it not possible to refurbish the existing historic buildings without losing some of the town's character? The same was said of The Knowle, but refurbishment would not be a sufficiently perceptible change to enhance councillors' reputations!

As far as I'm concerned you should just leave the Port Royal area alone. Its quite nice as it is and it certainly doesn't need any interference from any architects, scoping studies or councillors who just talk round and round in circles and end up leaving US, repeat US, with something WE don't want. The Lifeboat, while not perfectly situated, is quite adequate for purpose where it is and would cost far too much to re-site it at Clifton which would be the ideal spot but I don't think anyone would want that. Leave it as it is. The sailing club is also quite adequate for purpose and doesn't need to be touched. With the shelters the clue is in the name. They provide shelter in inclement weather and quite apart from that are a nice place just to sit and look at the view or whatever. The fisherman's yard also has a clue in the name. True it is higgly piggly but that is part of the attraction and it is undeniably a part of our fishing heritage. I suppose the toilets might benefit from some updating and maybe slightly enlarging but has there really been much of a problem to date. As I indicated in the survey I am totally against any re-siting or removal or pedestrianising of the turning circle. It gives the ability to drive along the seafront and back whilst taking in the view, an activity which gives pleasure to countless tens of thousands of people. On top of that where is the traffic supposed to go ? Out through Eastern Town ? Totally unsuitable. And like in folk week a lot of people would just use the car park to turn around in which is also unsuitable. As far as I'm concerned the only thing which needs attention is the Drill Hall which obviously needs tidying up. All it needs to make it presentable, is a lick of paint. To make it usable, well that might be a bit more involved and I don't know the condition of the building so cant comment, but if it was refurbished inside and perhaps put some new windows in, then surely its in a perfect position to be used by somebody as a cafe or social hall or maybe even as a Jurassic interpretation facility of some sorts. Whatever happens do not just knock it down. And as far as accommodation units are concerned I think that there should be absolutely none whether for the financing some grandiose scheme or not. And don't even go there as far as a five story block of flats is concerned. APART FROM SOME TIDYING UP THE GENERAL POPULATION DONT WANT IT EVEN IF THE MONEY MEN DO AS THEY SEE A PROFIT TO BE MADE. APART FROM A FEW RETIRED HOBBYISTS WHO SEEM TO HAVE INVOLVED THEMSELVES AND A FEW COUNCILLORS WHO WANT TO PUT THEIR NAME TO SOME GRANDIOSE SCHEME BEFORE THEY'RE GONE, NOBODY WANTS IT CHANGED SO JUST LEAVE IT ALONE. (Deleted DPA) it should be retained, refurbished and re-used. (Deleted DPA)

There is obviously now seen via the press total confusion by the public as to what is a "proposal" or not. There seems little obvious note from the Council's proposal concerning the longer flooding issues, apart from saying that residences need to be up two stories. There is masses of anxiety in he town now that the five-storey idea will rolled through whatever people in the town think. (Deleted DPA) I feel confidence by those I meet and mix with in both Town Council and EDDC is low. Why? Only just the last week or two has a simple task of deck-chairs been sorted; the way that with disregard to all the financial constraints the idea of improving rather than shifting East

Devon Council offices is going ahead, without any obvious plan for the site; there has been lack of long-term commitment to sorting out the potential flooding issues, despite there being experts on tides and currents in the town,.....and now we get this! I have also moved from a place where there has been far more recycling than even is taking place under the new scheme now in our area. With all this, can a resident have any real confidence that the proposal put forward by the Town Council and EDDC will not go forward as they want, rather than as the residents would like? The more you mess up and change Sidmouth's character, the less visitors will come, and the more it will turn into just like any other seaside town.

Sidmouth is short of parking so a reduction in public parking space is not an option in such a convenient location for the town. What Sidmouth doesn't need are prestigious seafront flats occupying upper stories in a building that would not look appropriate as envisaged at present. There needs to be a community solution found which does not require the flats to be built.

The reason people from all over the UK come to Sidmouth is because it has the character it has. This plan does not address that. The swimming pool, when it was developed, gave Sidmouth a modern facility for both residents and tourists, without taking anything away from the sea front. Admittedly there was originally a garage on the sea front itself, which was an eye sore and not an historical and cultural facility; that was happily replaced by the current block of flats. That is not the case with the current proposal. We probably only have one chance to get this right so please do not destroy it.

Why would you want to spend a vast amount of public money to ruin what is a delightful area of a delightful and unique town.

There must be no gross 5-storey development with additional flats and loss of public parking – all would detract from the charm of Sidmouth. Renovation of the Drill Hall would provide a perfect focus for a unique small-scale development which could enhance Port Royal by including restaurant and bar thus stimulating more visitor foot-fall.

Please don't build so high that it obliterates the natural sky line, we need to maintain the low-level profile of the buildings. We need to promote the area and the connections to the sea that Sidmouth has, including a decent boathouse for the Lifeboat, sailing club, angling club and new water sports centre.

I would prefer to see a more imaginative use of the site that's available. I want the fish shop to remain and I would prefer to see the Drill Hall incorporated into the plans, renovated and used as a community space. I think to demolish the Drill Hall is to miss an opportunity to preserve and use heritage. The concept that was presented at the exhibition was ugly and unimaginative and I doubt that in reality it will be able to incorporate the Lifeboat and Sailing Club in a way that will be practical and provide better facilities. I definitely don't want to see anything other than independent businesses operating from the site and I would expect to see a proportion of affordable housing,

The proposal is totally out of character with the area. One of the reasons I moved to Sidmouth many years ago was because developments like these were not present. Please don't spoil our town by pushing through this proposal and consider the 3R's alternative which is to refurbish the building which are already present.

The development is far too high and will dominate and blight the Port Royal area. Although neighbouring flats are 5 storeys their ground floor is set below road level and the proposed building towers over them. Any new development should look in keeping with the rest of The Esplanade. Why can't a smaller less obtrusive development be designed incorporating the needs of the organisations currently using the area? 30 flats is too many - they will give rise to a huge increase in traffic in what is currently a quiet area.

Re question 8: "If there was a new multi-function facility on the Port Royal allocated site, do you think you'd use the area more?" Yes, I would in principle welcome a 'new multi-function facility' - but not that which is being presented by the consultants. There are so many more options open which have not been considered. If I might comment: 1: It is unfortunate that the consultation did not limit itself to Opportunities and Constraints; there were serious misgivings when the outline of the Scoping Study was agreed to - namely, that the consultants would go beyond the limited remit of considering the site rather than speculating what could be placed there. 2: In which case, I look forward to seeing the full report which will contain this information - and only then can judgement be made on how well the information has been collated. 3. Meanwhile, the public has been presented with a proposal which is apparently 'not a proposal'. The prospect of a 5-storey building has raised hackles and has meant that the start to this process has been met with a generally negative response, which, again, is very unfortunate. 4. The two Councils therefore need to open their remit to include other options - rather than be seen to be pushing this project towards the simple matter of maximizing asset value. After all, under the Localism Act, local authorities must also consider the value to the community of any site. 5. When I attended the event at Kennaway House in June, I was told that if the current 'community based activities' were to be included, plus the 30 housing units demanded by the Local Plan, plus some commercial interest such as a restaurant - then Sidmouth would have to have a 5-storey building. It appears, however, that as the reaction to having such a large building has been so unfavourable (not only in the press, but unequivocally in the NP questionnaire), that this 'logical conclusion' will have to be dramatically rethought - and other, less restrictive and more imaginative, options considered. But that will, hopefully, be the next step. Finally, I have included my email address below and would indeed welcome the opportunity "to take part in future stages of consultation related to Port Royal". I have completed this survey as an individual and not as a representative of any group. I look forward to hearing from you - and indeed wish you all the best in putting together the final report.

The proposal is not suitable for the area! It is insensitive to the local area and businesses. It would destroy the unique beauty of the seafront. The Drill hall has historical value to the town, which should be preserved rather than destroyed. Better to retain, refurbish and re-use!

This is a highly flawed consultation. The greater site potential has not been looked at. The question has been framed in a way that the consultants can only propose one proposal of a poorly massed 5 storey block at the end of the esplanade. There needs to be options not just one proposal. This one proposal does not respect the grain or massing of Sidmouth and how it has grown slowly over the years. The existing facilities, Lifeboat, Sailing Club and Drill Hall; a once well used community facility until the maintenance was not kept up while in the care of EDDC. They are all non commercial enterprises that are for the benefit of every resident and visitor. The proposal of shoe horning these facilities under a hat of apartments will mean that there is no chance of future growth of these community facilities. We are a seaside town. We need the community space returned to the Community for the use of the Folk Festival again, a Classroom for our local schools, a place for exhibitions, fayres, talks, award ceremonies and parties of all our varied societies that have grown in Sidmouth's very strong community. The Drill hall is a historical asset and should be reopened as soon as possible. A community facility on the seafront is a great asset. The stow ford community centre out of town that you have to drive to as the council didn't build it in the right place and therefore is not used very much. The Drill hall is needed for the community to use that is in a walkable distance of much of the town. Very sad that the council have not maintained the community asset. The money should have been spent on bringing the Drill hall back into use not trying to build a 5 storey block that is ill thought out.

Instead of letting the area go into disrepair invest in the buildings. Craft fairs artisan crafts art shows etc. could be put on in the Drill hall. These buildings are an asset to the town and irreplaceable. Please spend the money on the drill hall it's a iconic community building which my family has had much benefit from using in the past.

This consultation is full of errors. It is based on one proposal at B4 of creating a 5 storey development without clearly demonstrating the actual 'research' that has led to this consultation being based on such a proposal. Before any consultation was launched, any aspect to do with the site should have been openly and transparently cleared up first. This includes actually carrying out hard research on whether the development of private homes is genuinely needed on the site, alternative funding options to avoid

such a development, reassignment of housing allocation within the Local Plan, ensuring that every element of the site is investigated for ownership, viability, possible issues relating to development, and possible planning constraints. This consultation has no basis because none of these things have been done first. Without any of these it has no foundations. At least one alternative proposal should have been put forward in this, or any consultation. That should provide an alternative option, or options, such as development that makes use of existing buildings, for people to consider. By setting the consultation out such as this it only invites people to comment on one proposal and therefore it would seem likely that the future of the Scoping Study will be based on the responses to that one proposal. That does not make for an open, equal, fair and transparent consultation. Not much else to add as this consultation should not be happening in this form, but Sidmouth would be destroyed by a development such as the one that is proposed here. The size and mass would completely destroy the character of Port Royal. One only has to look at Trinity Court. The apartments would mainly be second or holiday homes and the area would become dead culturally and physically very quickly. Port Royal has always been the 'Old Town' of Sidmouth and many people go there simply because of that. They like it because it is unspoilt by development. Port Royal is a blank canvas upon which to build over time from the inside out. Retain the strengths of the area - its heritage, the fish shop and fishermen's yard, the watersports, the Ham, and add over time a food and drink outlet by basic investment now in the Drill Hall, a pedestrianised area, a cycle hire, etc. etc. - and populate the area and within five to ten years go to phase 2 with an expanded offer that might see a larger, appropriate, development take place that is driven naturally by the community and visitors to the town. It has been, and is being done, increasingly in towns across the UK, Europe and ROW as a more sustainable way to regenerate an area that focuses on a new and responsible kind of tourism, generates significant and manageable income that increases over time, and meets the demands of long term inward investment. That is surely preferable to solely looking to sell the site to one, or more, outside developer? Not really sure that is how you work though..

The Ham land was gifted to the town and should not be used for private development of the area.

There needs to be far more evidence that funding solutions other than the provision of yet more overpriced and over-scaled apartments have been thoroughly explored and that alternative design solutions have been publicised and considered.

There must be no 5 storey development and loss of public parking.

I would like to state in the strongest possible terms that I find the bias in this questionnaire intolerable. I have been unable to answer nearly all of the above due to the ambiguous nature of the questions. Port royal and the ham was bequeathed to the residents of Sid mouth for the good of the community. It currently functions well as a multi function facility and could easily be improved with access to the drill hall and a more home-grown approach to development of the site. A five story development of luxury flats will not only be a carbuncle on our unspoilt promenade, but will also result in the sort of dead zone only too apparent at the marina in Exmouth. Flats bought by rich out of towners as investments or second homes. It is a denigration of our community and should be seen for the social cancer it truly is. The only folk this plan will benefit are the developers, investors and I'm afraid, our misguided local authority. I do hope someone with some honesty and common sense prevails in this matter. (Deleted DPA)

The main concern for Sidmouth Lifeboat, as has been said on many occasions, is to continue to provide the emergency service (Deleted DPA). It is not clear from Board 3 section D if the possibility of making East Street car park multi-storey has been considered as a way to resolve parking capacity. (Deleted DPA).

The inclusion of the building shown in the exhibition panels is at odds with the views of the community due to scale, height and a lack of vision about what to include and how to achieve. There is a real potential to join up and work in partnership with the community such is the strength of value for Port Royal. A clear process and the generation of a range of innovative options that reflect that an approach which only considers one option for raising money for the development is short sighted. The huge opportunity to do something 'different' and progressive between both councils and community will be lost if there is intransigence in approach from the outset. The loss of

the wet fish shop in our view would be disastrous for the cultural and heritage links it brings to the community and in terms of economic benefit to the town. We are creating activity and opportunity based on our fishing heritage which has unlimited potential if we create the right conditions and therefore we support regeneration that takes account of this and works proactively with the community. (Deleted DPA). The exhibition material whilst not a proposal has triggered much concern as it lacks vision and a real exploration or scoping of what is possible and compromises the natural environment. It also seems to work in isolation to issues such as the need to deal with the coastal erosion at Pennington Point and to see the Beach Management Plan progress and the access to and retention of the beach is critical to this area. To see them in isolation is not in our view workable as a sustainable solution for long term benefit economically, culturally and socially.

(Deleted DPA) I find this development idea totally unacceptable. It is not an opportunity but a destruction that if allowed will ruin the Sidmouth seafront for good. This is a totally misleading questionnaire. It is also a very poor questionnaire with ambiguous questions that are not specific enough. The ham is bequeathed to Sidmouth residents and should not under any circumstances be developed. We should keep it that way for future generations. Sidmouth Town Council should not allow this and be held truly accountable. Who is this to benefit? Not Sidmouth residents. 30 apartments/homes? This will be 30 second homes or 30 luxury homes or 30 totally unaffordable homes...There is no thought to affordable housing. There has been no historic value taken into consideration in this questionnaire. There is no consideration in this plan to the fact that the river and the sea flood this area. Port Royal and the Ham was bequeathed for the good of the community and this development is not for the good of the community. The Drill Hall should be passed back to the local community for their use. The Sidmouth Lifeboat, Gig Club, Angling Club and Sailing club should be retained as they are and refurbished. The traffic chaos would be ridiculous. We do not need this area to be pedestrianised. Sidmouth is a living /working town not a theme destination. There is no mention in this questionnaire whether any of the groups/ clubs at Port Royal even want any change. What factual research is there? Where is evidence that we need 30 luxury flats /houses or any of this development? What provision for affordable housing is there? given that now the lower end of Sidmouth from the Ham to the ford has rapidly changed from permanent homes to second homes, holiday lets and a development of luxury new homes. Sidmouth deserves better than this and this development would ruin the whole seafront.

This proposal should be scrapped. Only the Drill Hall should be developed - as a much needed communal public space on the sea front complementing Sidmouth's primary function as a historic tourist resort. The sea front is our town's most precious asset - please do not ruin it!

(Deleted DPA) I am particularly affected by the current lack of affordable housing as I look towards the future, and as such the plans being proposed here fail to fill me with any confidence in the Town Council and EDDC and the proposed development. I, like many others, am concerned by the lack of clear, concise information about the nature of the proposed development - given that the 30 apartments would be on the seafront and more importantly, are intended to fund the rest of the project, it seems highly unlikely that the 'homes' would be in any way affordable to the average local population, especially those under the age of 30 looking to buy housing in the area. Having seen the increasing number of second homes, luxury apartments and luxury retirement developments in the area and other similar coastal towns across Devon, Dorset and Cornwall, I believe that the type of housing development proposed is totally unacceptable. The area was bequeathed to the community, and yet the proposed development seems nothing but detrimental to the local population - the pedestrianisation of the area would cause traffic disruption, a 5 storey building would cause an eyesore, and infinitely more importantly, would be unable to provide any sort of assistance to combat the current affordable housing crisis. The regeneration of the area could be solved by the return of the currently disused Drill Hall to the local community to be transformed into a community hub for the entire generational population all year round, rather than the proposal of plans which when viewed with a critical eye reveal a proposal which in its ambiguity could as easily effectively create a luxury theme park for those who can afford it as it could a development which would support and bolster the local community. Given the events seen over the last five years concerning the Knowle

Council Offices, I am not inclined to put any trust in the council to carry out the latter, and I am inclined to believe that the manner in which the proposed plans intend to create a 'regenerated area' are totally inappropriate with regards to both the area and its historical relevance, and most importantly, the local community.

I feel we need to concentrate on younger people's needs. We need to retain as much as possible while retaining our history and provide more leisure activities for young people both those in our community and visitors. The area needs to improve its looks and if pedestrianised more it would be a safer area and could also be good to look at.

Question 11 simply does not make sense. It states that the site is a small site and yet your proposal shows it is not. It is ridiculous to build the new homes and new premises in a high risk flood area. Port Royal does not need an ugly carbuncle on it, certainly not 5 storeys high and certainly not comprising luxury apartments that are likely to be second homes. This is exactly the sort of scheme that sucks the life out of towns bringing benefits only to the few involved in the development. Sidmouth must not be allowed to become another cloned seaside town. Residents have been asking for years for the drill hall to be restored, options have been put forward that EDDC completely ignore because it is not their aspiration. EDDC finds funding when it suits them to, such as the now highly expensive relocation to Honiton. The most recent flood predictions which predict a rise in flooding and re-designation of flood must involve a revisit of planning. This 'proposal' is entirely unsuitable for Sidmouth, and totally lacks imagination. This ridiculous proposal completely ignores the fact that Sidmouth is desperately short of parking spaces and you are now proposing to build on the car park, without giving any indication of where you propose that people park instead. Do you want local people to shop in Sidmouth or not? Do you want more visitors to Sidmouth or not? If the answer to the previous questions is yes, then people need to be able to park their cars. Of course Sidmouth Life boat deserves to be given the best possible opportunity to do its job well, and I would like to see their representations.. I am very concerned - Sidmouth deserves better and the residents of East Devon deserve more respect than this 'consultation' offers. When residents have put forward ideas for this area, the plans have been dismissed by EDDC. Why is that?

Please let's get imaginative with this area. Let's build something we will be proud of - and which is future proof. Let's have a really exciting design. Look at some of the ideas that emerged in last year's architecture competition. Sidmouth needs to appeal to young people as well as older people. There is plenty here for the older generation - this is an opportunity to balance that with something different. Please please please do not blow this opportunity!

More car parking spaces won't be needed if you DON'T build flats there, build them inland. Any flat built on the seafront will be premium price and not affordable to young people/families/locals. They will be bought by landlords for holiday let or out of town rich. There must be other ways. Get the investors to build elsewhere and keep the tourists coming by keeping the character of our seafront. Also, with regard to a large build i.e. 30 flats etc. must have an impact with regards to flooding...it is only a few years since all that tarmac was ripped up by water damage. Local people love this town for its current character.

General comments (Deleted DPA) applauds both EDDC and STC for initiating the study which we hope will in time lead to the regeneration of this dilapidated area. We support studies and action which will make the area attractive for residents and tourists. However we feel that the study as presented in the Display Boards, is flawed, in that it:-

- Portrays a "Concept Proposal" which is not called for in the TOR, and asks the public to comment on the Concept, without any supporting evidence or data that might underpin it. The Questionnaire further reinforces the impression by asking public comment on a sketch on one of the boards at the Exhibition. EDDC and STC have said that the sketch is only a "concept" at this stage, but we believe that producing it has been a significant error, and is misleading the public at this early stage. The "Concept Proposal" presented only gives the public an opportunity to comment on a "large, poorly massed" building
- The "Concept" Proposal, or area that has been considered as available for development has apparently been confined to Area E03, (shown on the Local Plan for Sidmouth), thus omitting the opportunity to consider and evaluate other areas, such as the car park and the Boat park that might give rise to more appropriate development opportunities.
- Fails to mention of any use of the Boat park to the north of the Ham
- Fails to explore the use of the existing car park, "Area D" as a development area.
- Apparently fails to take into account the fact that Areas A and B are in a Conservation area.
- Apparently fails to take into account that there is severe contamination in the area.
- Uses area of the Ham which are legally and properly part of the inheritance of the town. There is no evidence so far that this intrusion has been quantified and assessed.

Next Steps The TOR say that the Final Report

will be prepared following the public consultation and that the Reference Group will review it before it is subsequently sent to EDDC and STC council's for comments. We trust that this procedure is held to We note that the Report, when finally presented, will indicate the next steps. We believe that the next stage must NOT include the Building on Area "A"; and the consultants must be able to start from a "proposal free base", and should investigate what might be achieved in the area should funding not be available for the construction of new facilities and housing We believe that both councils need to be flexible in their approach to what is possible on the site. Any development of the Port Royal area should consider the retention and enhancement of existing buildings as the basis of a Sea Sports facility and Lifeboat House as an alternative to complete ground up redevelopment. The Drill Hall is an old building and may warrant further investigation. The Questionnaire in detail

1. The closure of Esplanade to traffic from the Lifeboat station eastwards, with primarily pedestrian usage, is an interesting proposal, which would enhance the sea front. But further investigations must take place to assess the best way of maintaining the ability of passenger coaches to be able to turn round at this end of the Esplanade (e.g. an allocated area at the existing lifeboat station from where they could reverse safely into Ham lane. Further investigations should also consider achieving this through the use of "shared space" with pedestrians.
2. A suggestion for any building along the sea front in the position shown as within "A" is not supported. neither is the adoption of area "A" as a general area of Building development. This area should not be built on, the existing open views from the Ham to the sea should continue. Any sea frontage development should occur only on the existing Lifeboat station/ Sailing Club/ Drill hall site, not further eastwards
3. Area "C" (the traffic access to Area "A"), would not be required if Area "A" were not developed
4. We are very disappointed that the Study does not investigate the possibility of undercroft car parking on Area D with building above. This could cater for any new residential and perhaps Restaurant proposals.
5. There should be no reduction in car parking areas and if new housing is proposed parking should be increased to meet the proposed demand. .
6. A centre for sea/water based activities, (a Water sports centre) , (not just the sailing club alone, should be developed. Area "E", (lifeboat station, sailing club), must have direct access to the beach. The existing facilities, (Lifeboat/Sailing club..) must maintain direct access to the sea. We supported the creation of a "Multi-Activity centre" (Community facility)
7. We noted that the 30 dwellings on the Local Plan were derived arbitrarily and that a modest increase might be acceptable, if sensitively planned and designed, if their provision gave rise to greater funding possibilities.

This development not needed

Would impact negatively on existing residents through more traffic and lack of car parking is already challenging and would do more so

The area needs development but NOT 5 storeys high, & they need to be kept in scale with other buildings. Homes need to be built but they should be for local people only & not by any means to be used for holiday lets & they need to be affordable not £1million properties.

Yes. We do not need housing or a high rise block in this area. One floor should be an open hall where local crafts people and other traders are able to set up their stalls to provide both more employment and an outlet for locally produced artefacts, goods and produce. We lost that when the market that is now the Factory Shop. That would be a draw for visitors.