

## HOLT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – DRAFT 1.5 CONSULTATION

### HOUSING FEEDBACK

Total forms received – 62

Not everybody responded to every issue, so the totals vary. There was also some ambiguity in the form as many people didn't tick the overall Objectives boxes but appear to have assumed these were headings, hence low scores.

	Keep	Amend	Drop
<b>Objective H1: Ensure the housing development on the Tannery site reflects the wishes of the village and delivers maximum benefit</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>
H1.1 Ensure the site becomes a mixed-use development, roughly 50:50 commercial and housing	42	10	0
H1.2 Ensure the preferred options for the types of housing is reflected in the final plans	53	1	0
H1.3 Ensure that any need for affordable housing is met within the Tannery development	47	6	1
H1.4 Ensure that the new housing is a mix of properties to buy and to rent	51	4	2
H1.5 Ensure that all new housing is of a high standard of design, landscaped, sustainable and has adequate off-street parking	55	2	0
H1.6 Ensure that a full environmental survey is undertaken and the results made public before any development work starts	54	0	1
H1.7 Ensure that infrastructure development takes place alongside any new housing and is in progress before the build is finished	55	0	0
H1.8 Holt PC believes that new housing on the site will be sufficient to meet the needs within Holt for the foreseeable future	48	3	0
<b>Objective H2: Restrict new infill housing</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
H2.1 There is a general feeling against new infill housing but any new applications will be considered on an individual site basis	49	2	3
<b>Objective H3: Refuse new housing on greenfield sites</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>
H3.1 There is a general presumption against new greenfield development for housing	52	1	3
<b>Objective H4: Consider the conversion of redundant farm buildings to housing</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
H4.1 Ensure that adequate infrastructure provision is in place for any such conversions	52	0	3

### COMMENTS

#### General

- Ref p11 1.3, 3<sup>rd</sup> line Recent new building: There are 15 houses in Lions Orchard, not 14 as stated.

- Before the Tannery site is developed, proper access must be made, so that the problems with parking in The Midlands are not made worse.
- I think the biggest challenge facing the village is to achieve the best integration of the Tannery Development, particularly the access to/from the B3107. Making the Midlands one-way so that traffic onto the B3107 was single line would help. However, I think the best thing to do would be something more innovative around the Village Hall to shift the centre of gravity that is in front of the Shop to the area behind. The VH car park should become public and be extended on to Holt Joinery, etc, to remove need to park in the road around the shop. I imagine some of the 50% commercial in the development would be for the general public to use and that could be linked in with the Village Hall area to make an open piazza arrangement. Even demolishing the Village Hall is an option, allowing greater freedom to solve the traffic problem, and replacing it with a more modern design within the new development would have its advantages. I realize that there would probably not be enough money for anything too grand but a poor compromise would be a bad legacy.
- Whilst calling up Core Policy 43 is necessary, I think that Core Policy 45 is important in that it clearly states that new housing must meet the demonstrable needs of the community in which it sits – “Housing size and type, including any distinction between flats and houses, will be expected to reflect that of the demonstrable need for the community within which a site is located. The Wiltshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment identifies the housing needs of Wiltshire. Any variation to this will need to be justified through the production of new, sound evidence from either an updated Strategic Housing Market Assessment or other credible evidence source. In relation to affordable housing other sources of credible evidence include the council’s housing register and local needs surveys.”
- The constraints suggested in H3 should apply in equal measure to any part of a proposal which encroaches onto 'greenfield' abutting a brownfield site. Extension of the built-up length of the main road may, exceptionally bring benefits. It should be a stated objective to resist the combining of two small dwellings into one large one, a practice which has occurred extensively in the village as no planning permission is required. In contrast the plan should encourage the sub-division of oversized properties where opportunities arise, as has been successfully achieved at Starfield.

### H1.1

- Needs to be flexible according to demand.
- Holt already has several industrial areas including small units tucked away among residential areas – do we really need more?
- 50:50 – Limiting. Note what happened in the Spa development when commercial/housing split was specified – high rise flats!!
- 75 housing 25 commercial.
- 50% commercial seems to be too high. The type of commercial development needs to be defined and closely controlled and developments in keeping with a rural village only allowed i.e. no heavy industrial development etc.
- What will be the actual percentages?
- Dependent on the type of commercial development, maybe a 60:40 split for housing/commercial.
- 60:40 in favour of housing particularly starter homes.
- Not necessarily 50:50, so long as the other objectives are met.

### H1.2

- Not too many 4/5 bedroom houses. Please can there be some suitable houses/apartments for the over-sixties. There are a lot of local people living in larger houses and would love to ‘downsize’ to smaller houses/flats, and this would ‘free-up’ larger houses in the village for

sale.

### H1.3

- I wonder whether this places too onerous a responsibility on Tannery developers given the large decontamination expenses they will face – I wonder if a few more affordable houses could be built adjacent to the Jephson housing?
- Affordable housing should be for people with connections to Holt and should not be for families/people 'imported' to ease housing problems elsewhere.
- Any affordable housing should meet needs of people currently with direct links to Holt – this should result in limited need and needs to keep the balance of housing stock reflecting the current make-up of the village.
- If there is a mix of affordable/bought space must be included for young people within the site.
- More privately affordable houses and less council funded.
- This may not be possible. Clearing the site.

### H1.4

- Doubtful practicality.
- Greater emphasis on privately individually purchased properties.
- Not necessary if the mix in the whole village is OK. And how could it be enforced?

### H1.5

- The sustainability, landscape, amenity and visual impact of a development can be specified as a condition of planning consent using section 106 as a tool. Holt PC should develop a vision for what this means i.e. what do we want it to look like? My suggestions (from a biodiversity/environmental perspective) would be to request the planting of a given number of native trees per area developed; to include permeable surfaces as much as possible; to include planting of native hedgerows on boundaries as an alternative to fencing; to include green roofs where possible.
- The acrimonious aside in point three of H1.5 should be omitted. Such opinion should have no place in what is intended to be a serious and well planned document.

### H1.6

- The contamination from this site extends far outside of the premises of the factory. I know to my expense!

### H1.8

- Depends on the contamination of the site, cost of clearing this.
- It will never be sufficient.
- To build affordable houses on a contaminated site is a tall order.
- Star Ground was purchased by Jephson Housing as an exception site for affordable housing. Only half (12) of the potential homes have been built. These are excellent starter homes tied by law to people from the village. Should we not be seeking to complete this development?

### H2.1

- Strongly agree.
- In the past there has been a lot of infill. But do agree that any new applications to be considered on an individual basis.
- I agree that infill development is undesirable; it reduces trees and opportunities for wildlife.
- The PC are looking to the NP for a policy on infill. This is not a policy.

### H3

- Needs to be flexible although preferred.
- One of the prime reasons for settling in Holt was that it has sufficient green areas surrounding it. My children and grandchildren have made full use of these areas. We must preserve these areas in perpetuity.
- “opposition to”?
- It’s the cost of clearing brownfield site, so I believe.

### H4

- Qualified to retain existing aspects.
- Surely not new homes bonus and CIL here when they are not mentioned under Tannery. Should we be staking a claim to new homes bonus from WC?