

HOLT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – DRAFT 1.5 CONSULTATION (Regulation 14) – APPENDIX 1

VISION – FEEDBACK COMMENTS & RESPONSES

Feedback comments	Response	Action
General/other		
Excellent Neighbourhood Plan.	No comment	No action
I think this is excellent and captures what has drawn and will keep me in Holt as a great place to live.	No comment	No action
Ensure the village’s cultural, historical and natural heritage, through encouraging the establishment of a working archive, which might include stimulating publications that promote the significance of Holt, in these terms.	Part of the Plan?	Add?
Encourage the establishment of a museum, which could bring together not only the story and provenance of the village, but also might offer an appropriate cultural and social setting, stimulating an historical endurance.	Part of the Plan?	Add?
The need of a replacement postbox at the east end of the village now the old post office box is out of commission.	This has now been done.	No action
If there are to be more residents in the same space the density of dwellings must increase. Many will have little or no private open space. An extension of the built-up boundaries by increasing the length 'built-up' especially towards Forwards Common would decrease the attractiveness of the route for through traffic and would potentially reduce the approach speed. Properties which include sizeable vegetable gardens reduce waste and save energy. The recent covering of a one time illegal car-park in a several feet depth of hardcore has already put paid to one of the best of the green spaces. While green fields and farmland may be ideal it is unrealistic. I see no reason why the village should not take its share of renewable energy generation – the proposed solar site near the canal and Trowbridge Sewage Works may be an ideal spot for such a venture.	Covered in more detail in Section 1 Housing. We do not believe in extending parish boundaries at this point. There is a proposal for a solar farm at the southern end of the village near the Trowbridge Sewage Works.	No action

A village with the same boundaries as today, surrounded by green spaces and farmland.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perhaps land on the Staverton side of the river to transfer to another parish on Trowbridge side. Possibly consider hiving off part of Gt Bradford Wood to Staverton as it does not seem to be part of Holt. 	There is now a proposal to use part of this land for a solar farm which might directly benefit Holt so we believe it is important to keep this land.	Delete this proposal.
In the present climate, is this a realistic option?	We believe it is.	No action
'A moderately enlarged population' – could be housed on brownfield sites but even the Tannery is contaminated. So I think the village may have to accept some boundary change.	We believe we should maintain the current boundaries.	No action
Within those boundaries, a moderately enlarged population housed on brownfield sites rather than infill building or on greenfield sites.		
Avoiding 'packed-in housing into any space going.	Agree, covered in H1.5	No action
'moderately enlarged population' – limited.	We believe 'moderately' is limited.	No action
No more people.	Not realistic.	No action
Infrastructure services fit for the number and mix of people who live in Holt – now and for the next 20 years.		
Retail facilities; should there be a restriction on where and what these should be.	Covered in Section 3.	No action
Pavements in Holt need to be reset to aid wheelchairs more safety.	Good point.	Add to Other Transport
Further improvement to the community resources which have contributed to Holt's thriving village spirit, as well as the creation of additional facilities.		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The older children urgently need leisure facilities e.g. skateboard area. • Build a skatepark. • Skatepark for the younger community. • Holt is in desperate need of facilities for teen children. A skatepark facility is critical. There are a lot of skateboarders who have nowhere to skate apart from carparks and roads. This is dangerous and damages new surfaces. Having this facility will keep children active and out of trouble. For this to work, there needs to be planning involvement with the children who will use it. If it is not good, they will 	We support this in principle and believe it could be added to CA2.1.	Add to CA2.1
Sports field available more in school holidays. Coaching sessions for football, rugby etc.	Good idea.	Add to Community Amenities
There needs to be a young person's wine/coffee bar (modern in look and music). This would keep the older teenagers in the village – there is nowhere that is directed to this age group. It could be used for private parties too – there is no venue for these in Holt.		
Also more basketball facilities. If grown-ups playing tennis, youths cannot use this netball area.	Good idea.	Add to Community Amenities
An all-round reduction in through traffic, including speed management, HGV control and adequate parking provision.		
Care needs to be taken with any reduction of through traffic as it is suspected that a reasonable proportion of Holt Superstores trade is from through traffic. The loss of the store I feel would have a large detrimental effect on the village.	We agree sustaining the shop is important and traffic proposals should ensure this.	No action
Keep – but no bypass because although traffic can be heavy, a bypass often 'kills' off a village.	Proposal T4.1 is simply to research opinion.	No action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate parking for residents not just visitors!! • Priority must be given to parking provision for residents – we pay the rates after all! 	The intention is that providing additional parking for visitors and workers will free up space for residents.	No action
'Speed management' – not humps.	Proposal is for speed management not humps.	No action

Traffic calming-reduction very important.	Agree.	No action
Improve the management of through traffic instead of 'all round reduction'.	The Plan has proposals to do both.	No action
I do not see it possible for reducing traffic in Holt, yes maybe HGVs, especially with development all around and also the population expanding.	Reduction in HGVs would be an important improvement.	No action
Traffic reduction is not going to happen.	This remains a priority.	No action
What does 'speed management' mean? If it means enforcing existing speed limits, fine, keep it. If it means reducing speed limits, particularly introducing variable speed limits, then drop it. If it means artificially reducing traffic speed by anything like speed humps or chicanes leading to single lane carriageways, then definitely drop it.	The intention is to achieve an overall reduction in speed through the village; precise details of the means tbc.	No action

HOLT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – DRAFT 1.5 CONSULTATION

OBJECTIVES – FEEDBACK COMMENTS & RESPONSES

Feedback comments	Response	Action
General		
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
Housing		
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
Traffic, Parking and Transport		
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

Commercial and Economic Development		
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
Environment, Energy and Green Spaces		
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
Community Amenities		
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.

HOLT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – DRAFT 1.5 CONSULTATION

SECTION 1 HOUSING – FEEDBACK COMMENTS & RESPONSES

Objective no.	Feedback comments	Response	Action
General	Before the Tannery site is developed, proper access must be made, so that the problems with parking in The Midlands are not made worse.	Covered	No action
	Ref p11 1.3, 3 rd line Recent new building: There are 15 houses in Lions Orchard, not 14 as stated.	Will be corrected	Amend
	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.	Agreed Residents are opposed to this as it will increase traffic flows and speed To be discussed with the developers as the revised master plan for the site is made public	No action

	<p>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.”</p>	<p>Agreed, but as we are not likely to have a new Housing Needs Survey in time, what ‘evidence’ can we produce?</p>	<p>Amend this?</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>Agreed, we should reflect the current review of settlement boundaries.</p>	<p>Amend this?</p>

H1.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	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
H1.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	The percentage splits reflects the views gathered in earlier village surveys. Retirement homes are included.	No action

H1.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p>Worth considering extending the site in Station Road in addition?</p> <p>The criteria for eligibility for affordable housing are clear and include a local connection.</p>	<p>Amend this?</p> <p>No action</p>
H1.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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? 	<p>The mix reflects the views gathered in earlier village surveys.</p>	<p>No action</p>

H1.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p>Should we add more detail here?</p> <p>Agreed (although it does reflect opinion)</p>	<p>Consider amending</p> <p>Amend</p>
H1.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The contamination from this site extends far outside of the premises of the factory. I know to my expense! 	<p>The contamination survey will be made public before any action is taken</p>	<p>No action</p>
H1.8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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? 	<p>This reflects the wishes of the village to limit overall development.</p> <p>Worth considering – see above</p>	<p>No action</p> <p>Amend?</p>

H2.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	Expand this in the light of the settlement boundary review.	Amend
H3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	Amend or clarify this in the light of the settlement boundary review.	Amend?
H4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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? 	Clarify references to CIL and New Homes Bonus payments.	Amend

HOLT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – DRAFT 1.5 CONSULTATION

SECTION 2 TRAFFIC – FEEDBACK COMMENTS & RESPONSES

Objective no	Feedback comments	Response	Action
General	There continues to be a large volume of traffic which is not local to the village but just passing through.	Probably, but more information from a survey is awaited,	None
	The main priority should be to keep this traffic moving at a suitable (realistic maximum) steady speed with minimum obstruction to its smooth flow	Disagree – the main priority is to divert it elsewhere	None
	There is a thread running through this section which seems to assume that anything which reduces traffic speed is good. I understand that recent surveys have shown that in fact exceeding the speed limit is not a serious problem.	Whether or not the limit is exceeded, it is a fact that villagers feel intimidated by both speed and size of vehicles.	None
	I feel that the few who do so will not change their habits or behaviour if new restrictions, inconvenient and irritating to everyone, are introduced.	Which “everyone”? Not villagers. This is a matter of enforcement which is mentioned elsewhere in the Plan.	None

	<p>I would not, in principle, be against a speed limit of 20mph right through the village, although I seem to remember that such is not allowed on a road of B grading. Such a limit would have very little effect on passage times through the village.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the general perception, especially with people just passing through, would be that it is an annoying and unnecessary restriction and, unless very strongly policed, would be widely ignored bringing the regulation into disrepute</p>	<p>How to reduce speed is to be determined, whether by signage or environment changes.</p> <p>Wilts Council will have to determine whether a limit can be introduced, if the Plan finally suggests one is necessary.</p> <p>People “just passing through” should be reduced by other proposals in the Plan.</p>	<p>To be considered</p>
	<p>Page 5 – Traffic, Parking etc. This should be adjusted to match the vision that requires adequate parking for residents and workers as well as visitors. It seems to me that following the opening of the Glove parking lot the real growing problem is parking for residents</p>	<p>Agree, but not sure the Glove parking lot will entirely solve the visitor parking problem.</p>	<p>TBC</p>
	<p>Page 15 The last PC vehicle count registered over 10K vehicles per day. The Kingston Farm traffic assessment has been done and plans approved. Earlier you said that 20mph restriction required at the zebra – here it says that the zebra slows the traffic.</p>	<p>Not sure why Kingston Farm is mentioned.</p> <p>Check this alleged contradiction</p>	<p>Amend if necessary</p>
	<p>Pages 15, 16, 17 and 18 are a long description of problems some of which have tackled earlier. No solutions are proposed.</p>	<p>It’s because these pages are <u>supposed</u> to be a description of the problems, not the solutions!</p>	<p>N/A</p>

T.1	<p>In general, improve pedestrian footpaths throughout the village – many are in a very poor state of repair. Also need to consider disabled access and use of pavements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasise improving pavements and footpaths. • Raise pavements on B3107 where traffic regularly mounts them – e.g. between junctions of The Gravel and Station Road 	<p>Already in the Plan</p> <p>Ditto</p> <p>May not fit in with general idea of a new streetscape</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>TBC</p>
T1.1	<p>OR – cutting away some of the encroaching bank and building up a proper pavement. Also, reducing the width of the opposite pavement to accommodate parking and give more for the Recreation side pavement.</p>	<p>Considered but rejected</p>	<p>None</p>
T1.1	<p>With the proviso that removing existing pavement does not increase the speed of vehicles through the village.</p>	<p>Speed limit will remain</p>	<p>None</p>
T1.1	<p>Provided it does not significantly reduce the overall area for games etc, and does not impinge on existing trees</p>	<p>Will not affect games area, but some trees may have to be cut down</p>	<p>None</p>
T1.1	<p>Keep the footpath but with the grass bank cut back to make the footpath the original width.</p>	<p>Considered but rejected</p>	<p>None</p>
T1.1	<p>Have traffic lights at Ground Corner and outside the (United Reformed) church so traffic knows when to travel safely. (Alternate single carriageway working?)</p>	<p>In general, traffic lights were rejected within the village as not in keeping with the village ambience</p>	<p>None</p>

T1.1	Moving the stretch of footpath on the north side of The Street into the Recreation Ground is a good idea. General impression is that this footpath is rarely used by pedestrians (who can use the footpath on the other side of the road). The extra width of carriageway would improve the flow of traffic along that stretch, provided, of course, that parking was not allowed on the north side of the road.	Agreed	TBC
T1.1	Not sure I would use it on a dark winter night.	Entirely up to the respondent, but lighting would be part of the move!	None
T1.1	This has been tried and failed and not for lack of money. This stretch of road also has major problems with vehicle damage for resident's parked cars. Therefore it would be sensible to approach the problem from a different angle. This was looked at before and the survey then revealed a BT cable duct under the footpath on the recreation ground side. BT quoted quite a large sum to re-locate the duct (£75K I think). Despite that there is an opportunity to move the road over that footpath (£75K is not a lot in road building terms), build out proper parking refuges beyond a full width pavement on the Walk side of the road. Alternate one way traffic flows could be considered as per Bradford on Avon.	Considered but rejected See above re traffic lights	None

T1.1	<p>I disagree with the proposal at T1.1. No statistic in the background and rationale for this section suggests that this path is dangerous. The path was constructed 3 feet wide in the early 1960's alongside a widened carriageway on land acquired from the Parish Council. Fifty years of neglect by the highway authority has resulted in a grossly overgrown hawthorn hedge containing flourishing example of ash, field maple, hazel and elder as well as cultivate briar pushing its way onto the foot way which is severely overrun by motor vehicles. The original 5 inch kerb face has been reduced to 10mm by successive resurfacing without raising the path level. An established ash tree planted in the memorial field overhangs and is damaged daily by tall goods vehicles with the resulting debris further hindering the few pedestrians who use the path. The path is not for the faint hearted and single file is recommended. I use the path twice daily and have been touched by a passing wing mirror on one occasion in the last ten years. There is a currently safe alternative route called "The Walk" where the pedestrian is protected by a No cycling Order which is not well signed yet seldom disobeyed. It cannot be very attractive to cyclists!</p>	<p>It may not be "dangerous" in recorded statistics, but it is intimidating, hence few people use it.</p> <p>Agreed</p>	None
T1.2	<p>Only allow 2 way traffic at the western end of the Midlands as far as Dawes Pond. All traffic leaving the Glove Factory and the new development to leave via the eastern end by the traffic lights.</p>	<p>Traffic management in The Midlands will be part of the Planning Application for the Tannery</p>	<p>Make this clear in the NHP</p>
T1.2	<p>My proposal for one way working would obviate the need for this "improvement". The prospect of increasing traffic through the heart of the village goes against all planning principles.</p>	<p>Ditto</p>	<p>Ditto</p>

T1.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any informal crossing should not restrict parking outside Holt Superstore, as to do so would affect the viability of the store. Provided it doesn't affect passing trade for the shop! Only if it does not affect Superstore 	Agree	TBC
T1.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is not clear to me what defines an 'informal' pedestrian crossing. In fact, given the difficulty crossing at this point as a pedestrian, and the difficulty negotiating the stretch of road between this point and the Ham Tree Inn as a driver, I think a formal Pelican crossing could alleviate both problems with one solution. What is an informal crossing? What we do now? Try it as an experiment if there is a history of road accidents involving pedestrians at this point. 	<p>See above re "streetscape" proposals and undesirability of traffic light solutions</p> <p>None as far as I know – experiments</p>	None
T1.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restriction to cars only is not realistic. What about one way? 	Not popular with Midlands residents	None
T1.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Restriction to cars only impacts on residents of The Midlands. 	Not so	None
T1.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have traffic lights at this junction, with the one set of lights set back by the telephone exchange so there is only one way working at the eastern end of the Midlands at one time. The perceived problem could be overcome with signal control – see below. 	See above – rather not have traffic lights – but may depend on Tannery planning	None
T1.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not sure this is necessary and could be the "thin end of the wedge" with everyone wanting a 20mph limit. 	Maybe	TBC

T1.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce speed limit to 20mph throughout the village.(x3) • 200yd speed limit causes confusion – 20mph through village preferable. • I am against short sections of road with different speed limits. They are a source of irritation to motorists, who should be spending their time concentrating on driving safely, not looking out for yet more road signs. I am not convinced there is a significant hazard at this crossing and, in practice, conditions at the northern end of Station Road already limit the speed of cars there. • Don't think this would be observed as some ignore 30mph. • Why not 20mph through the whole village. Other communities are doing it and the whole of Bristol is going 20mph. WC just keep saying no so we need to be more positive. 	<p>There are rules about imposition of 20mph speed limits which are difficult to fulfill in Holt at present. However, a new streetscape may make it easier.</p> <p>Enforcement is a problem – the police do not have the resources to do it.</p>	TBC
T1.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Last winter my wife and I circumnavigated the village just after a snowfall. The only point at which there was any danger was the “new” pedestrian crossing. Had it not been for the alertness of the driver of a westbound car she would have been killed as she was thrown into the road by an uncontrollable slide down the long, steep, pimped slope from the footpath to the crossing. This approach is potentially dangerous as it has both endfall and crossfall and is quite the worst approach to a crossing I have ever seen. The preferred drop-off zone for the school should be at the grass play area in Little Parks. I have made a suggestion below which would cure this problem. The piecemeal introduction of 20mph lengths of a classified road is hardly likely to be approved and would certainly not be respected. 	<p>Not sure residents would like it</p> <p>Agreed – see above</p>	TBC

T1.6 & 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will protected parking be for residents only? (named residents/residences) . • Not sure! 	To be determined – requires a Traffic Order	TBC
T1.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Altering the layout of the Little Parks junction could have a benefit for parking. However it should not have the object of reducing the carriageway width below two clear lanes, thus impeding the steady flow of through traffic. If extra parking is essential in that area there is a large space a short way down Little Parks, which could be taken over for parking. But, say I, perish the thought 	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Presumably the green – not agreed</p>	None
T1.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is the first mention in the plan of reducing speed for traffic LEAVING the village. It should travel at less than 30mph until it leaves the built up area. 	Agreed, but it is a matter of streetscape and enforcement – see above	None
T1.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not a good idea. This will cause much revving of engines, much braking, increase of pollution and long traffic queues. This was proven when the three houses at the end of Melksham Road were being built recently and traffic lights caused queues of vehicles, including heavy lorries, reaching from the lights past the entrance to Little Parks. Build-outs would have the same effect. Bear in mind also these chicane-type obstructions do depend on the “good?” will of the driver. Many drivers do tend to accelerate when approaching these obstructions if traffic approaching from the other end. 	Part of streetscape plan	TBC

T1.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I would be very much against this one. It sounds as if the proposal is to have build-outs (chicanes) which would restrict the carriageway to a single lane, to provide parking spaces when, in fact, parking along this stretch is not (yet?) a significant problem. I wonder how many parking spaces would be provided when suitable access requirements to all the properties on both sides of the road were addressed? More pertinently, the proposed arrangement would seriously affect the flow of traffic. Vehicles would be braking to an unnecessary halt, with revving engines as they started away again giving increased noise and pollution. Such single lane working can and does cause significant tailbacks, with their consequent delays, as experienced during Monday rubbish collections and when repairs necessitate the use of traffic lights. To increase such delays, noise and pollution by design is a seriously bad move. There is an added problem with these chicane-type obstructions which does nothing to add to the safety of the roads. 	See above	None
T1.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would need to see plan before passing opinion. 	OK!	None
T1.7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This proposal will reduce the available roadside parking. 	Depends on final design	None
T2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 40mph signs on the lane Tollgate to Staverton are too high considering bends and visibility. 	They are at statutory height	None
T2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A system of chicanes – as at BoA, Bathford, and Coronation Avenue in Bath (it works very well) – should be considered 	Part of streetscape planning	TBC

T2.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I disagree with the Proposal at T2.2 To renew and maintain all white painted road markings in the village. On the section of main road abutting the playing field there is one short line marking out the centre of the carriageway. There was once a series of such lines forming a continuous pattern but fortunately these have not been replaced after subsequent resurfacing and patching. To put them back would indicate that traffic heading towards the shop from the Green should always take precedence over opposing traffic which should always wait until the road is clear. There is barely sufficient width for two moving cars to pass and the present 'give and take ' arrangement works well. It would work better if the 'courtesy' white line at the entrance to the Church were extended to include the length opposite the main entrance to the Playing Field. There is sometimes a car parked on this section of road which obstructs the entrance of large vehicles into the field and, more importantly obstructs the view of vehicles approaching from opposite ends of the line of parked cars. The Highway code recommends that vehicles should not be parked on the inside of a bend. There is space on the straight section west of this point for thirteen cars to park. There are thirteen properties fronting the road between the Church and the Green. Several have ample off-street parking. The best practical solution would be the provision of light controlled shuttle working which could probably cost less than the extensive tarmacking of yet more of the Playing Field. A single white line 2 metres long should be laid where the path from the Tollgate crosses to the War Memorial to deter the thoughtless motorists who obstruct the footpath and force pedestrians onto the grass. The Objective T2.2 should be "Review periodically the requirements for white lines." 	Agreed	TBC
------	---	--------	-----

T2.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• This would affect residents on the Lions Orchard development facing on to The Midlands by removing the option of being able to park a second vehicle outside their property. (Only one designated parking space is allocated to each of these properties.)• Double yellows are for towns not villages.• I disagree most strongly with the proposal in T2.3 on several grounds. First it is misusing a useful traffic restriction intended to increase the capacity of a carriageway. There is insufficient space for traffic to travel on the carriageway at this point in two directions simultaneously, with or without the restriction. Vehicle parking with one set of wheels on the single foot way is obstructing the safe route for pedestrians, If the problem of parking on this section is not resolved by the building of the massive car park now under construction and a few sharp words from the Community Policeman I should be astonished. If all else fails the replacement of the current kerbing with the standard half battered urban design at the recommended level above the carriageway would certainly achieve the objective required. The cost of the necessary signs and lines and their maintenance is a waste of public funds. The effect of introducing yellow lines on side roads is to encourage parking on main roads. Bradford on Avon at Springfield is a fine example of this error of judgment. The only yellow lines in the village were introduced to provide a safe environment for the school crossing patrol to operate. The school crossing patrol no longer operates at this point and parents are actively discouraged from allowing their charges to cross the road at this point. The introduction of yellow lines throughout the main road would increase the speed of traffic travelling through the village.		Despite the comments, this will be done shortly
------	---	--	--

T2.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is just as likely to move the parking problem into the Gravel where the residents already have parking issues. Introduction of white lines in Station Road just exacerbate the problem in The Gravel – I acknowledge the problem of parking, but this just moves the problem somewhere else. Include the junction between The Gravel and Station Rd 	Everybody wants to park all their cars where it is convenient to them – not possible!	None
T2.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Considering the number of residences either side of the B3107 in the Leigh Road area with no off-road parking facility, more thought is needed to assist current residents in the conservation area. ?Provision of secure parking at Manor Farm for residents, OR perhaps it is time to consider a compromise by sacrificing some “green” areas for layby parking. 	Who will buy the field and make a car park? <u>Unpopular!</u>	TBC
T2.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents should be consulted on this point before any lines are painted 	Part of implementation process	None
T2.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whilst single white lines are an appropriate deterrent for undesirable parking (e.g. at the junction of Beckerley Lane with the B3107) they should be implemented with careful consideration so as not to push parking further into residential areas 	Part of the planning and implementation process	None

T2.4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The introduction of yellow lines at the junctions of the main and side roads would invite motorists to park at the ends of the restrictions. The white courtesy lines at Station Road seem to work quite well. <p>The words "where this is particularly undesirable" is a subjective and unprofessional phrase and should be replaced with "where it regularly occurs and causes obstruction or material reduction of visibility." The clause should end at this point as "such as" and the detailed spots mentioned are inappropriate in a document of this nature.</p>	See above Agreed	None TBC
T2.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The signage on a highway is a matter for the Highway Authority and as such is outside the control of the Parish Council. An illustrative booklet of approved designs is available on-line. The style and size of approved lettering is closely defined. The use of unauthorised signs is a potential cause of accidents on the Highway. The latest example is that advertising the School function held on Friday 27th June, still obstructing visibility at the junction of Leigh Road and the B3107 on the morning of the 28th. The lettering on the sign is too small to be read by passing motorists making it useless for its intended purpose. The erection of the sign was irresponsible and illegal. 	PC is currently considering an "unofficial" signage policy which covers this	TBC
T3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Doubt if this is possible Ban all 6-axle lorries from the village! Most important part of the whole plan. Strongly agree. 	Being investigated by PC	TBC
T3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ban shouldn't be necessary once the gap road is open This road may never be built. 	Construction started August 2014	None

T3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why not try for 7.5t? Environmental weight restrictions are imposed to prevent large vehicles from using inappropriate roads, routes and areas. They are legally enforceable but allow access to property within the restriction. The restrictions aim to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o reduce danger to pedestrians and other road users o prevent damage to buildings, roads and bridges o preserve the character, amenity and environment of an area o reduce and manage congestion on the roads. 	Sounds worth trying	TBC
T3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would be more useful if less specific. Replace the ending from “once the etc.” with “by supporting any proposal in the surrounding area which would supply a more attractive alternative route for such traffic currently on B3107 	Worth adding	TBC

T4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would probably be too expensive to be considered. • Not if this means losing green field areas. • Include any impact future changes to major roads e.g. A36, A350 & their HVG traffic being pushed through Holt. • But not to be ransomed by large housing developments! • A bypass could affect the viability of the shop – no shop and the village dies – Beckington is an example of this. • No bypass – it will kill off the village – look at Beckington! Passing trade keeps the village shop and PO alive. • Sorry, but this issue created a great deal of bad feeling in the village when it was last looked at, before our time here, and we cannot see any point in resurrecting the issue which was rejected previously – after a lot of heated discussion. Can we just respect the conclusion they came to then?? • I am not particularly in favour of a bypass, I think it reduces the vitality of a village but anything that could be done to reduce the number of large lorries should be pursued. • Is almost certainly pie in the sky. Once the County Council had elected to improve the A350 route from M4 to Warminster and Somerset had constructed the Frome by-pass any small hope of a strategic route to take through traffic out of the village faded. The only other option is to accept a material increase in the size of the settlement as was done at Chippenham which obtained a western bypass of sorts at the expense of the purchasers of house in the extended residential area. When this option was tried a few years ago in Holt it met with strong opposition which is unlikely to have changed - yet. 	Is it worth leaving this proposal in?	TBC
----	---	---------------------------------------	------------

HOLT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – DRAFT 1.5 CONSULTATION

SECTION 2 PARKING - COMMENTS & RESPONSES

Objective no.	Feedback comments	Response	Action
P1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have a plan to clear the pavements in Holt of cars parking on them. It is only a matter of time before we read of an accident to mum and child in pram/pushchair forced to walk in the road because the pavement is unusable. Would like to see this discussed by the Parish Council. 	The law says no parking on the pavement, the local interpretation is that as long as there is space for a pram then OK – otherwise report to police with reg no and they will follow up.	Not sure we want to take any
P1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Address congestion in Station Road at school and particularly pre-school arrival and leaving times. Suggestion – parking-free gaps on west side of Station Road at the main road end near the school (The Gravel to Bradley Lane). 	This periodic congestion is better than blocking the Gravel, which happened prior to the wig-wag lines. Drivers will have to be patient	None
P1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One way system round The Midlands. It has been suggested the The Midlands become a one-way system. This is not in the interests of the residents of this area as a one-way system would create a race track, more so than it is already. At the moment 2 way traffic certainly slows traffic down. Nothing very positive has been said about providing parking. A lot has been said about stopping people parking in different areas, but there does not seem to be any initiative to alleviate the dire needs of existing residents without parking facilities. The Parish Council should be encouraged to come up with some solution to this problem – it can only get worse unless something is done. 	To await detailed planning for Tannery development. One way system not popular with Midland residents	TBC
P1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nothing very positive has been said about providing parking. A lot has been said about stopping people parking in different areas, but there does not seem to be any initiative to alleviate the dire needs of existing residents without parking facilities. The Parish Council should be encouraged to come up with some solution to this problem – it can only get worse unless something is done. 	Agree – something needs to go in	TBC
P1.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Surely this huge new car park will cater for all parking? 	No!	None
P1.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Surely the National Trust should provide its own parking? 	Agree – negotiations underway	TBC

P1.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• I would question the assertion that existing car parks currently become full. This is contradicted in the background statement which claims that the “informal,” overflow car parks are seriously under-used. Surely the Village Hall car park is just as informal as the other two.	Clearly needs a rewrite	TBC
------	--	-------------------------	------------

HOLT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – DRAFT 1.5 CONSULTATION

SECTION 2 OTHER TRANSPORT – FEEDBACK COMMENTS & RESPONSES

Objective no.	Feedback comments	Response	Action
OT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The implied insult in the first line should be rationalised. Careful or painstaking would be less offensive than “intelligent”. 	Agreed	TBC
OT2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I strongly support improved links with neighbouring villages – not just as a cycleway but also for pedestrians. The distances are not great if it was safer, certainly for a one way journey with a lift or bus for the return. 	Agreed	TBC
OT2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I think that a stronger case could be made for this and it needs to be now. Kingston Farm and the Tannery are being developed by the same people. Much of the route would be over Kingston Farm land. That just leaves Manor Farm to release the rest! 	Agreed	Pass to PC for urgent action
OT2.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please ensure people who live in The Gravel can still access their homes by car. We do try to be considerate around school arrival and departure times 	Agreed	Note for detailed plan later
OT2.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Including the provision of infrastructure e.g. bicycle parks at school/shop/cafes. 	Good idea	TBC

OT2.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The parents of individual children are, or should be the best judges of where their offspring can cycle in safety. I would let my children cycle only in the Playing-field until I felt them to be competent on a bicycle. As a twelve year old I was permitted to cycle through the centre of a large city, unaccompanied. One rule does not fit all. 	Noted	TBC
OT2.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very necessary – quite unsafe cycling to BoA or Trowbridge. • Once in Staverton there is a safe canal tow path cycleway to Bradford. 		None Noted
OT2.2 & .3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make Staverton Lane single lane traffic up to the village, with a cycle/pedestrian lane at the side. Three weeks ago a middle-aged Holt cyclist was almost killed by a car and a van tearing past him up the hill around the blind corner by the farm. Only the fact that I was doing my customary 25mph around that bend prevented this happening, and also my car, husband and myself from being injured 	This is one possible solution	TBC
OT2.2 & .3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explore cycleway along the route of the railway line. There were two tracks, now only one, this would leave a short distance to the K&A canal. 	Worth pursuing	TBC

<p>OT2.4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This could be a hazard, as the roads are not nearly wide enough. • B3107 too narrow for provision of cycling lane of safe width. • The existing roads are hardly wide enough for two vehicles to pass, let alone having cycle lanes. This proposal needs to be realistic. • Cycle lanes are a nice idea but quite impracticable on these roads unless they are widened. “Think Cyclist” signs are a useful reminder for the short time after installation before they become part of the unnoticed background. • Nobody takes any notice of any notices like this at the side of the road. They only cause distraction as anybody who has driven up the Fosse Way to Leicester will know. • The existing carriageways are too narrow for cycle-tracks to be reserved. “Think cyclist” would serve as useful a purpose as the monstrous advertisements to “share” cars erected at many major junctions in Wiltshire to distract drivers who should be concentrating on the road and road users and as helpful as the screens at the Country Stores roundabout sighted to obstruct the view of traffic approaching from other directions. The proposed signs conflict with policies elsewhere in the Plan to reduce their number. 	<p>Should be investigated – Are the respondents correct?</p>	<p>TBC</p>
--------------	--	--	-------------------

OT2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Really interested in this – would be environmentally friendly (instead of driving to Bath, Melksham, etc. But, need to consider parking and driving routes to station. • Option to take train from Holt of benefit to the young (as non-drivers); working people (to avoid some commuting driving and shopping trips); and older people who don't drive. • Should seriously be considered. • Good idea. • How much does it cost to stop a train? 	Good points	TBC
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a riverside walk to Bradford and Melksham. • Provide a proper footpath between Holt and the river. Consider a pedestrian bridge linking to Staverton . This could be cantilevered off the existing railway bridge to provide support and reduce construction costs. • Reopen F/P 57 to give safe pedestrian access to Broughton Gifford, Whaddon and Melksham 	Possible additions	TBC

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

HOLT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – DRAFT 1.5 CONSULTATION

SECTION 4 – ENVIRONMENT FEEDBACK COMMENTS & RESPONSES

Objective no.	Feedback comments	Response	Action
E1.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why plant trees on all green spaces & play areas? • Create open green frontage to the Midlands. • What happened to the trees planned to be planted in the new car park. 	<p>Trees are not only an attractive feature they are important for a healthy environment in reducing CO² and diesel particulate pollution. Included in current draft.</p> <p>Planting of the trees is part of the Planning Permission. (??)</p>	Add: The species and number of trees would be selected to suit the site in consultation with residents.
E2.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This land has been dormant long enough to minimise any risk. • Should already be covered by strict national legislation 	<p>This would depend on the nature of the contamination. The risk will be known once a full assessment has been made.</p> <p>There are strict planning regulations regarding this.</p>	No action
E.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If land owners can cause far reaching pollution with huge bonfires and farmers can burn the contents of their slurry pits to generate electricity why can't Holt have its own waste incinerator to generate electricity. • No reference in the Plan to the destruction of the environment by littering, flyposting and tattered painted Parish Council notice boards. 	<p>There would be insufficient waste of suitable calorific value generated within the village to maintain such a facility which would mean HGV's hauling waste to the site. Unlikely that residents would want an incinerator or an increase in HGV traffic in or close to the village. Unlikely to get planning permission.</p>	The Neighbourhood Plan to include policies for dealing with this.

E3.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wiltshire Council currently provides a kerbside collection service for a large range of household recyclable materials and Household Recycling Centres in Melksham & Trowbridge for other recyclables and household waste. Is there a significant need to replace the original static facilities or provide enhanced facilities in the village? Would a comprehensive new facility work or be acceptable to residents in a residential area. No mention in the plan regarding the flytipping of household and other waste in and around the Village Hall waste bin. 	<p>Research into this Objective would suggest that expanding / re-introducing static facilities to receive recyclable household waste, whilst popular with a number of respondents, would not be wholly supported by Wiltshire Council. The Council's policy to invest in kerbside collection services has made recycling easier for householders and increased the tonnage of materials recycled significantly. Static facilities require constant servicing, monitoring and cleansing particularly if they are to be sited in public or residential areas which would only add cost to the existing service budgets with possibly little or no gain.</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan should further investigate the feasibility of this objective and to include policies to promote and encourage the use of the current kerbside recycling service.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan to include policies for dealing with this.</p>
E4.1 E4.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend to read: Explore pressing issues with regards to drainage and local watercourses in and around the village. Identify and liaise with relevant landowners and public bodies working to deter flooding. Clarify what is the floodplain. 		<p>Amend as proposed.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan to include plan of floodplain.</p>

Additional	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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. i.e. requesting 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.	Whilst each planning application will require individual consideration the Neighbourhood Plan should include principles of design schemes to be used by developers as suggested.	Develop and prepare new Objective for inclusion into the Neighbourhood Plan.
------------	---	--	---

HOLT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – DRAFT 1.5 CONSULTATION

SECTION 4 – ENERGY FEEDBACK COMMENTS & RESPONSES

Objective no.	Feedback comments	Response	Action
EN1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define what an “appropriate renewable energy installation” is. • Do not use the renewable energy debate to support future development in Holt. • Solar farms if appropriate within village boundaries to encourage the village to produce as much of its own power needs as possible. This could benefit the whole community. • Permit only schemes that do not spoil the look of the village, and take over the fields with large ugly panels. • Approval for a 20MW solar farm is being applied for at Cockhill in the parish. This is enough for about 8000 homes. We have less than 750 We should welcome and support this. • Consider biofuel incineration plants. • No windfarms / windmills. 	<p>What is considered to be an appropriate installation will be dependent on each individual case and its impact on the neighbourhood. There are Planning Regulations for such installations on Listed Buildings and in Conservation Areas.</p> <p>Solar farms / panels on unproductive farmland or in secluded gardens and suitably screened to minimize their visual impact do benefit communities and households.</p> <p>There would be insufficient bio-fuel generated within the village to maintain such a facility which would mean HGV’s hauling bio-fuel to the site. It is unlikely that residents would want an incinerator or an increase in HGV traffic in or close to the village. Unlikely to get planning permission.</p> <p>As above.</p>	<p>Published Policy that the Parish Council is advised of all proposed installations with eight weeks to object to any proposals considered inappropriate.</p> <p>Develop and publish guidelines and procedures to be used when considering applications.</p> <p>No action</p>

<p>EN2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In each case, reconcile these <u>energy necessities</u> with Buildings Conservation and <u>listed building restrictions</u>. • Encourage Wilts Council et al to consent to energy saving needs in listed buildings. Many are not permitted to have solar panels, double glazing etc. • Solar panels are ugly and greatly detract from the uniformity/attractiveness of buildings, especially old houses. They can affect the character of the village. Permission should take this into account and allow panels only when they are not visible from public areas/streets. • Upgrade or improve the current heavy and old power lines strung over houses/gardens? 	<p>There are Planning Regulations for such installations on Listed Buildings and in Conservation Areas.</p> <p>See comments for EN1.</p> <p>Removal of overhead cables would enhance the aesthetics of the neighbourhood. Possibly too expensive to be considered by Service Providers.</p>	<p>No action</p>
-------------------	--	---	-------------------------

HOLT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – DRAFT 1.5 CONSULTATION

SECTION 4 – GREEN SPACES FEEDBACK COMMENTS & RESPONSES

Objective no.	Feedback comments	Response	Action
GS1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Define FP34 which never seems to be usable. • Preserve the open aspect of unhindered green space on the Melksham road leaving Holt, with its significant views of the valley to the south. • Make investigations to ensure that green spaces are maintained and potential conservations areas are defined, especially with regards to areas of significant historical context, or outstanding natural beauty. • GS1.1 Grass/meadows grown for silage need to be protected from many trampling feet. Footpaths through these areas at certain times of year need clear signage to request keeping to the footpath. • Have early consultation with new land owners about footpaths. • GS1.2 Include cycleways. More off-road cycle paths, to Melksham, Trowbridge and Bradford on Avon. • Improved access to the river and a riverside walk. 	<p>Will need to research this response !</p> <p>It is the intention of the Neighbourhood Plan to implement policies and procedures to preserve the rural surroundings of the village.</p> <p>A significant proportion of the village is within a conservation area.</p> <p>It is recognised that many do not adhere to the Country Code. The Parish Council and Wiltshire Council do place signage on stiles the land-owner/user is also entitled to place such signage.</p> <p>The Parish Council and Wiltshire Council do engage readily with land-owners.</p> <p>The Draft Neighbourhood Plan does recognise that better connections to existing cycle-ways need to be explored with Wiltshire Council, Sustrans and local land-owners.</p> <p>Currently access to and along the Avon riverbank is over private land where there is no public right of way.</p>	<p>The HNP Group to investigate.</p> <p>Objectives to include: The Parish Council will work with Wiltshire Council and relevant landowners to protect other areas or features within the Parish that are brought to the Council’s attention.</p> <p>Include more detail in the HNP with possible options to explore.</p> <p>PC would need to speak with land-owner who may want to formalise current arrangement.</p>

<p>GS1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reinstate FP57 which was closed for a foot-and-mouth epidemic long forgotten. This would give safe pedestrian access to Broughton Gifford, Whaddon and Melksham. Upgrade to cycleway. • 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. 	<p>Will need to research this response !</p> <p>Dog poo bins are already provided by the Parish Council in a number of locations. Dog walkers should be advised and encouraged to pick up and bag their dog's poo wherever it defecates and dispose of it properly in dog poo bins, litter bins or take it home and place in their own household waste wheelie bin.</p>	<p>Add: Publish relevant aspects of the Clean Neighbourhoods & Environment Act 2005 and make available to dog owners and dog walkers</p>
<p>GS2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GS2.1 Some provision should be made for lesser green spaces – the little green and narrow green, to be used to provide parking at some point in the future. • Investigate whether all green spaces ought to be designated as assets of community value. • 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! 	<p>Whilst the issues of car parking for those who have no off road parking facility is fully understood it is considered neither possible nor desirable to change its current aspect. Both the Little and Narrow Green are within the conservation area and are therefore protected and recognised as extremely important assets of community and heritage value.</p> <p>It would be difficult to define significant. Where present parking arrangements are hazardous to pedestrians or other road users: The approval for the creation of a limited number of parking bays on green space(s) outside of the conservation area may be considered by the Parish Council where such changes would not detract from the overall amenity, community or environmental value of that area.</p>	<p>Do we want to include or make reference to such a policy within the Plan ?</p>

GS3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interest already received for allotment and volunteer to help set up. • Encourage the use of 'unwanted' gardens as vegetable plots 	<p>It is very encouraging that there is interest.</p> <p>This is currently happening within the village on a personal basis.</p>	<p>The HNP to include more detailed proposals to develop allotments?</p> <p>Firstly however to canvass households to determine level of interest.</p> <p>Possibly run campaign in VMag ?</p>
------------	---	--	---

HOLT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – DRAFT 1.5 CONSULTATION

SECTION 5 - COMMUNITY AMENITIES – FEEDBACK RESPONSE

Objective no.	Feedback comments	Response	Action
CA1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If we had a new hall/sports centre then the present hall and sports pavilion would be redundant but must ensure any new building is done before the old is destroyed. • It would be such a pity to lose the present village hall, but a Community Centre with facilities for family activities/youth groups etc would be great for the village. 	Agree	Amend wording of Plan
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why build a new one? • The current village hall seems appropriate to current need and for the foreseeable future. • Would not consider this as a priority. Other issues more important. • Not needed – existing village hall is a thriving concern. • The existing village hall appears to satisfactorily meet all the requirements of this type of facility. • Do we really need a new village hall? 	Possible reasons for new building are outlined in the Plan – these comments do not negate them	None
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fully support any future objective that removes young people from the roads. 	Agree	TBC

CA2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eleven statements of support for the provision of a skate park. • Replace the underused 2nd tennis court with a skatepark – more children will use it than the small number of privileged middle class adults who can occasionally be seen on it. • Skatepark in place of 2nd tennis court. • How many hours a day does a tennis court have to remain unused before it can be converted to a skateboard park? 	This is a recurring request and should be added to the Plan	Add
	Other comments on Amenities included under appropriate sections of Responses		