

HOLT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – DRAFT 1.5 CONSULTATION

SECTION 3 – COMMERCIAL FEEDBACK COMMENTS & RESPONSES

| Objective no. | Feedback comments | Response | Action |
|---------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|
| CE2 | How much development? Recent purchasing of the fields by the GF is and should be a cause of concern for all Holt residents and should be openly discussed by the Parish Council. | Current agreed development has all been through the planning process. | No action |
| CE2.1 | Decent signage to car parks and on-site parking for Glove Factory. Get as many visitors cars as possible off The Midlands to allow for easier access for residents, and more space for the lorries to pass through. | Agreed and covered in Section 2, P2.2 | Add something to P2.2 re signage? |
| CE2.3 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poss. of favoured short hire terms for residents. • And other future facilities (gym?). • The cafe is too expensive for village folk. | Details of use not covered by HNP. | No action |
| CE3.1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OK in principle but do not be too prescriptive. • 50:50 – problem as per Spa development. • 50% commercial development seems rather high. It very much depends on the type of commercial development proposed and its suitability to village environment. • More housing than commercial on Tannery site preferred say 60:40. • Should state - ensure that sufficient housing is provided to meet needs, within brownfield and encourage commercial development on the rest! | Same as for Housing: the 50:50 split reflects the views gathered in earlier village surveys. If changes to this balance are proposed by the developers, these will be considered. | No action |

| | | | |
|--------------|--|---|------------------|
| CE3.2 | This needs to say what the percentages are of. | These are % of the total commercial development. | No action |
| CE3.3 | Is this realistic? It is certainly not what is planned. | We still believe this is a desirable objective to pursue. | No action |
| CE3.4 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs to be in place before work starts. • Is Broadband inclusive of cabled services provision? • Given the high % of self-employed, encourage the development of high-speed broadband for businesses and enterprises in Holt. • Fibre optic broadband should be here by the year end | <p>We believe current wording is fine.</p> <p>Fibre optic broadband is due to be delivered to the telephone exchange in 2014.</p> | No action |
| CE3.6 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning permission should precede the start! | Agreed and this is covered in more detail in Section 4, E2. | No action |

| | | | |
|-------------------|---|--|--|
| <p>CE4</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explore possibility of reinstating a station! This would presumably be advantageous for commercial development. • This site would be really useful should BR ever decide to re-open Holt Halt, and so I would not like any development which would impede this. • If there is any possibility of re-opening Holt station it is not a good idea to use the site for other purposes. • It depends what this could be – bearing in mind Station Road is already clogged up twice a day with school traffic, and there are a lot of older people living in the area. Increased traffic would be a major problem. • As long as station still viable. • Possibility of re-opening station, like Melksham? • Could be tied to 50:50 Tannery development, if additional commercial available is Tannery req'd? [sic] • Control any increase of commercial traffic during school drop off hours, Station Road is too narrow. • What commercial activity? • Noting the limitations of access of Station Road. • Reopen the station. Wouldn't be needed if Tannery site development. • Concerned about potential traffic on quiet single road through Gaston/The Star with commercial development. • All objectives as for CE3 should apply. • The old coal yard has recently been sold and planning granted for development into a storage site for scented candles. | <p>This idea has proved very popular and we believe the current wording reflects that aspiration.</p> <p>We believe the site is potentially large enough to sustain both a re-opened station and some commercial development. See Section 2, OT3.</p> <p>We are conscious of the implications for traffic and should maybe spell these out more clearly.</p> | <p>No action</p> <p>No action</p> <p>Add something re traffic issues to Section 2, OT3?</p> |
|-------------------|---|--|--|

| | | | |
|--------------|--|---|------------------|
| CE5 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does this really belong here? | We feel this is a legitimate aspiration to include in this Section. | No action |
| Other | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A couple of forms had 'Skatepark please' added. I do not wish to comment on this section as it seems pointless to do so in a climate where the arrangements appear to be do as you want and if anyone notices ask politely for retrospective planning permission. | Being addressed in Section 5. No comment. | No action |