

## HOLT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – DRAFT 1.5 CONSULTATION

### OBJECTIVES – FEEDBACK COMMENTS & RESPONSES

Feedback comments	Response	Action
<b>General</b>		
I cannot answer some of the objectives as I do feel that too much building/commercial development will eventually mean Holt will not be a village – more a town!	We believe that the overall Vision is committed to preserving Holt as a village.	No action
<b>Housing</b>		
Provided limited building of new housing appropriate to local need.	We believe the proposed Housing Objectives and Policies will deliver this.	No action
Underline building on brownfield sites.	This is already emphasized by Policy H3	No action
Possible add ‘... deliver suitable homes from brownfield sites for both...’ which links to the vision. Agree that this is captured in [Environment a].	Adding this might make this objective stronger.	Amend Housing Objective 1
<b>Traffic, Parking and Transport</b>		
Care need to be exercised with reducing through traffic for the reasons detailed overleaf [impact on the shop]	The Plan is committed to sustaining the viability of the shop and any traffic proposal will take this into consideration.	No action
I feel that through traffic is a ‘given’ which will have to be accepted and managed rather than changed.	All surveys of village opinion have shown a majority of villages would like to mitigate the impact of traffic on village life which the Plan addresses.	No action
This is the key to the redevelopment of the village. There must be another look at a bypass either north or south of the village. A bypass would or should if planned properly be the ultimate answer to traffic etc.	A bypass is a contentious solution and the Plan commits to considering this again but proposes other shorter-term management measures in the meantime.	No action

<b>Commercial and Economic Development</b>		
There must be a limit to how much space can be used for expansion of any businesses.	The Plan proposes clear limits.	No action
No more industrial sites! These bring large commercial lorries.	The Plan wants to preserve Holt as a working village but the proposed new commercial sites are limited to businesses which will not be dependent on HGVs.	No action
If the old railway station is included for development a speed limit for Station Road MUST be included and HGV control implemented.	Agreed that these are vital so spell this out more fully.	Amend CE4
<b>Environment, Energy and Green Spaces</b>		
Add the word 'significant' to green spaces in consideration of parking needs of those residents with no off road parking facility. We are after all surrounded by green space!	The green spaces covered by this are listed in 4.3 and will be included in the final draft.	List in Objective GS2?
Lovely though the greens are, with a growing population and some households owning 2+ vehicles, at some point in the future the narrow and little greens, in particular, should be considered as potential parking areas.	Surveys of village opinion to date have indicated that preserving these as green spaces is a higher priority.	No action
Only schemes that do not spoil the look of the village, and take over the fields with large ugly panels.	Preserving the appearance of the village is a priority and is covered in Objective EN1.	No action
What type of renewable energy? Solar, windfarm, biofuel incineration [?] – none in keeping with the village.	We believe this is covered in EN1.	No action
'local energy provision' – depending on scale and impact.	We believe this is covered in EN1.	No action
More people means more dogs. Great importance for keeping areas to walk our dogs. More well-maintained dog poo bins. Where fields are used for livestock or silage etc, encourage people to pick up dog poo & provide bins. Dog poo is damaging to livestock.	We understand this point but do not believe the issue of picking up after dogs is within the remit of the Plan.	No action

What is appropriate? Wind turbines – definitely no. Solar farms – only on carefully chosen and screened sites to minimize impact on the countryside, particularly the views.	We believe this is covered in EN1.	No action
<b>Community Amenities</b>		
Build a skatepark.	We support this in principle and believe it could be added to CA2.1.	Add to CA2.1
Encourage parents of teenage children to take a more proactive stance.	We do not believe this issue is within the remit of the Plan.	No action
Should this not include Conservation of historic areas and buildings?	Good point.	Add something to CA about the Conservation area and historic buildings more generally.