

**HOLT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – Leigh Road, Ground Corner and Ham Green - FOCUS GROUP
FEEDBACK FORM**

Date of Meeting: 8/8/2012

Venue: 19 Leigh Road

Number attending: 10

Bob and Shirley Crouch

Bob and Tina Davies

John Fletcher

Alison Prike

Jenny Beale

Marcha Nicholson

Brian and Marian King

Christine Flannery

VISION

Anything missing? Anything you'd like to change?
Discussion points: What is a village and what constitutes a village feel/sense of community? The present village economy is partly maintained by the through traffic e.g the village shop.

Page 2. OBJECTIVES

	Agree	Not sure	Disagree
a) Statement is too vague – need to be specific regarding future planning etc			
b)	unanimous		
c)	Unanimous		
d) Need to qualify this – eg more apprenticeships, skills based jobs, priority to locals?			
e)What do we mean by this – density, village infrastructure etc			
f)	Unanimous		
g)	Unanimous		
h)	Unanimous		
i)	Unanimous		

PRIORITIES

1. C – Reduce impact of through traffic

2. F - Preserve the Green Spaces – in fact build on them - increased access?

3. I – Sustain Holt as a vibrant village community

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Anything missing? Anything you'd like to change?

Text change: –

paragraph 2 – strike 'ranging from the sublime to the ridiculous'

Paragraph 1 page 4 - insert Vital instead of 'very important'

Discussion points:-

Which comes first – The Council or the local plan?

Need for clarification of the purpose of the Neighbourhood plan – our chance to have a say in future planning, etc.

SECTION 1 – HOUSING

WHAT WE HAVE

Anything missing? Anything you'd like to change?

Test changes:

Paragraph 1.1.3 page 5 - houses on an old **Builder's site** – lose possessive apostrophe!

Demographic data from the Wiltshire Housing Survey – e.g. ages of respondents.

Discussion points:

What do we define as affordable housing – Housing Association part rent part buy?

Will Holt fulfil its quota of housing under the Wiltshire Core strategy if the plan to build 50 dwellings at the Tannery site takes place? In other words will this mean no more major build in the village for a foreseeable timescale?

I feel that consideration should be given to re-assessing the comments 'tick boxes ' As we discovered, it is not possible to tick the agree/disagree/not sure when the item it refers to is purely a statement of fact /statistical info. Maybe re-phrase the item to-' surveys shows that 50% wanted X, 27% wanted Y' the other big issue on this element is that the stats are fairly meaningless as people ticked multiple boxes? So maybe omit percentages completely and ask , do you want X, Y or Z? using the options which were highlighted in the original survey. (John's Comments)

WHAT WE WANT

Our Comments	Agree	Not sure	Disagree
a)Housing to be divided into 30% for each need grouping			Unanimous re no new housing
b)As above but be clear that this was a Tannery Site Survey – do we want this for the whole village?			
c)As above			
d)This is a statement - we cannot vote on it			
e) Who will be the landlords?	Yes with reservations		
f) Need also to consider sustainability of village infrastructure and services.	Yes with reservations		
g)Need a balance in housing types including starter and elderly residential.	Yes but....		
h)General discussion re impact of in-fill no conclusion reached.			

PRIORITIES

1. If Tannery development goes ahead can we be assured of no new major housing developments in the village? We do not want more than 50 houses.
2. No creep into green field areas
3. Be wary of figures and percentages of survey. Need to clarify that the Tannery Survey was done by the Steering group not the developers (who have done their own survey).

Pages 8-12. SECTION 2 - TRAFFIC, PARKING & TRANSPORT

WHAT WE HAVE

Anything missing? Anything you'd like to change?

WHAT WE WANT

2.2.1 Traffic	Agree	Not sure	Disagree
a)			
b)			
c)			
d)			
e)			
f)			
2.2.2 Parking	Agree	Not sure	Disagree
a)			
b)			
c)			
2.2.3 Other transport	Agree	Not sure	Disagree
a)			
b)			
c)			

PRIORITIES

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

SECTION 3 - COMMERCIAL & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

WHAT WE HAVE

<p>Anything missing? Anything you'd like to change?</p> <p>Text changes: Last –paragraph p 13 – ‘individual and quirky businesses! Not sure what this means.</p> <p>Discussion points: Concerns that the data from the Tannery site might be interpreted for the whole village – e.g the 50:50 split between commercial and housing only refers to the Tannery survey.</p> <p>Re word the Tannery Survey to the Village Survey by the steering group regarding the Tannery site to avoid misconstruing as done by the developers.</p> <p>Concerns expressed about potential piecemeal nature of the Tannery development and access issues.</p>
--

WHAT WE WANT

	Agree	Not sure	Disagree
a)			
b)			
c)			
d) i) ii) iii)			

PRIORITIES

- 1. Tannery Development should not be piecemeal**
- 2. Consider the supportive infrastructure require for the village to cope with new developments.**
- 3.Support for small businesses – what can the village do – eg provide lockups, small units at a reasonable rent etc.**

Focus Group for The Midlands held on 30th August at The Old Stable House, The Midlands

Present:

Chris Sellar, Dixcroft, The Midlands

Catherine Ayes, 112 The Midlands

Dee Hughes, 125 The Midlands

Spike Haward, 111A The Midlands

Heather Morris, The Old Stable House, The Midlands

Housing

1. Affordable housing needs to meet local needs i.e. be of appropriate style and size.
2. All new housing needs to be sympathetic to the village and be integrated into the community not a separate gated sector.

Traffic, Parking and Transport

1. The most important issue and the new development needs to provide adequate parking for residents, workers and visitors. This to be accessible at all times e.g. the present temporary overflow parking closes at 6 which is too early.
2. When will the double yellow lines on the bend in The Midlands be completed?
3. Strong feeling the The Courts also needs to take responsibility for its own parking and not use the Village Hall car park. The suggestion was to create dedicated parking in the field opposite the Tollgate and provide pedestrian only access to the Courts, via The Walk or through a new entrance into the arboretum on Ham Green. Need to explore the financial implications of this for the VH.
4. Village Hall car park only to be for VH users and the disabled going to The Courts.
5. The whole village needs to become safer for pedestrians, pushchairs and wheelchairs.
6. Would like a 20mph limit through the village with flashing warning lights at either end.
7. Unanimous opposition to the idea of The Midlands becoming a one-way street as this would create a faster rat-run, would mean that all the traffic drove the whole length, and is likely to be abused by people "just nipping in" to either Hawcroft or the VH car park.

Commercial & Economic Development

1. Important to retain space in the new Tannery development for valued local businesses e.g. the garage, Holt joinery & the Polish joinery.
2. Essential that the conditions for development only permit B1 light industrial use, no B2 businesses (e.g. printing). This will ensure that hours of work, noise and emissions are regulated. Also important that WCC enforces these regulations (which they haven't on the Midlands Light Industrial site).
3. Any commercial premises also need to be a quality build with good ventilation and sound-proofing (again, unlike the buildings on the Midlands Light Industrial site).
4. It would be good if there could be some village body (PC or separate committee?) with an effective means of monitoring and policing this and with some say about who are suitable tenants. Would the developers be willing to consider this?

Community Facilities

1. Concern was expressed about pressure on the school where some classes already have more than 30 pupils. Although there is room for expansion on the current site, the additional numbers (i.e. not enough to create a whole new class) may make this difficult.
2. We need a better bus service which runs at more useful times i.e. enabling people to get to work, or make train connections in Bradford.
3. Support for cycle paths to Bradford and Trowbridge, possibly within fields alongside the roads which are narrow and dangerous.