

What do you like about the proposal?	What do you not like about the proposal?	Any suggestions?	First name	Last name	Email	Street Address
	Having recently attended the meeting at Hitchin Town Hall regarding the above mentioned new proposed housing development at Highover Farm, I was asked to register my concern regarding the access and additional traffic on the Stotfold Road, due to the proposed development. As a regular commuter on the Stotfold Road for work, and also along the Cambridge Road, to get into Hitchin Town Centre, I am concerned at the additional traffic this development will cause. Hitchin is a hub between Stotfold, Shefford, Letchworth, Stevenage and Luton, and is used regularly to pass through for each of these towns and more to get to work, leisure activities and also for day to day living, access to shops, doctors etc.					
Proposals to create improved outdoor space.	It only takes one set of road works within Hitchin currently, and the whole town is gridlocked, how is a development of 700 homes not going to impact an already busy town, and cause even further traffic disruption, plus the wear and tear on the roads, that are not in the best of states.	Additional access to an from the site not via Stotfold Road.				
Drainage flowing to the back of the site. Connection to greenway.		Is the traffic split to lessen traffic to Stotfold Road? We haven't been advised of change. Will add traffic generally when highways said at planning meeting it would not add any more congestion. Don't believe this!				
That there is some green space (but not much). Keeping abus route. We'd like to keep the 81 bus (not have it hijacked to new estate). Thanks	I would be grateful to receive further updates on the progress of this development including potential amendments to the access and egress to minimise the additional impact of the traffic. The current volume of traffic is very hevvy, travelling dow the Stotfold Road + back up the Cambridge Road towards Letchworth as well. At the moment this creates a "rat-run" along the slip road of Stotfold road / Cambridge road (coming off Fresham Drive). Factor in another 1000+ cars- the situation can only get worse. There is a school at the end of the slip road + lots of young children walking to school.	More greenway and green space. Traffic feed from elsewhere than High Dane. The 81 bus already struggles to get up the hill with all the cars already, so an alternative entry point. There is a pencilled bridge but not on the plans for sure? Is this being considered?				
We agree housing is required but feel the traffic is already a nightmare.	Brick colour - would be better if it was in keeping with the local environment - sandy colour similar to growlands area as opposed to red. Launch of assets of social value beyong community centre at lower stages. Feel this should be a key part of development to turn it into a plan people want to experience not just live in.	Diagram with a no right turn at the end of Cambridge Road and a no entry sign in the slip road off Frensham Drive				
Plenty of green space. Ties in with the garden city principles (some).		May have missed this, but 3 y sports pitches?				
The phasing is beneficial for us as construction will affect us at a later point. The inclusion of green spaces in the development.	Fell nervous about the impact of the development on road congestion and pollution.	Please can I find out more about proposed improvements to the bus services and any lower steps to reduce car usage by new residents and recuce pressure on Cambridge Road. Please can I see the design for footpath onto Collinson Close				

	We had a visit from a member of your team recently re two trees on the boundary of our property (73 Grovelands avenue) We are awaiting the report but understand that the trees will be reduced in size. We have safety concerns regarding the trees as previously part of the tree fell into our garden during a storm. I like to open space and parks which are important in terms of welfare and environment. Pleased that the school will be built.	Have concerns regarding transport and congestion re pollution.
Between Grovelands Road & High Over the road is blocked off, stopping cars from using these roads as a "rat run". Whilst bollards are in place e-bikes and motorbikes still go through /pass these bollards. I walk our dog through this area and have close to having an accident from people using this road, despite, legal access. They do this during peak times - rush hour in the name	Not build. Take more instruction from local residents	More bollards, ANPR cameras. Strict control on access to roads/paths
The general development looks fine and will help house a lot of people.	Major problem is traffic, this existing traffic volume is a nightmare with a minimum of 1400 extra cars will cause serious problems for local residents. Cycle path into Collision Close is not necessary and against the wishes of residents and the building company consider is unnecessary.	Why is there not any medical facilities built into the scheme.
Nothing! Nobody listens to residents.	750 homes to be built in this area without better infrastructure is not a sensible thing to do, adding more congestion to an already congested town (Hitchin) The disproportionate amount of houses to be built. The effect this will have on traffic onto Cambridge Road - cars trying to de-tour into Grovelands which is a dead-end. The proposed pedestrian access in Collision Close. The access is designed to come across the top of the drive of no. 7 - the drive is on a slope + the visual view is impeded. Collision Close is a quiet residential road with elderly residents - the road will not give access to anywhere. Our concern is bicycles, motorbikes and scooters using our road as a race-track. The turning point at the top of the road is designed for ambulances, fire-engines, rubbish disposal carts and delivery drivers to turn. A recent visit by the Fire Brigade said that it is "madness to obstruct that turning area and is highly dangerous"	Scrap the whole idea and leave our field alone
Nothing. The site is much too big and out of proportion.	The number of houses - too many. The traffic issues that will rise in a town already struggling. The inclusion of a primary school where kids will have nowhere to go as secondary schools oversubscribed already. The construction traffics causing chaos. Potential drainage issues - hope the plan to overcome this works. For what it's worth! Will there be another (more realistic) road transportation survey carried out? (when no school holidays or Christmas holiday period) With 700 homes comes 700/1400 cars, the traffic will be horrendous (it's bad now). Will money be provided to amend the road systems!!	Yes, listen to what residents are saying! This is a waste of time writing to you as nobody is listening. It's all money, money, money!!
That Redrow are involved now.		Don't build the houses that 99.9% of people didn't want. Keep residents informed of all developments to avoid upset. Stop all site traffic going up Highover Way even if not construction traffic but archaeological.
		Overall the houses are required but will anything happen! (I think not)

Open spaces, good planning, play areas - but somehow (presumably the householders will be paying to maintain all this).	Why so many 4 & 5 bedroom houses on a scheme this size and so few "affordable" homes. I see foul water is going to a new pumping station but where will it be processed? The Cambridge road sewer system is already under pressure and failed in the September 24 floods. Are there any upgrades planned for the sewage treatment plant? Anglia water are already using the river in Ickleford for discharges. I know we need more housing but is this really the right scheme?	
Nothing!`	No solutions for the traffic! This is going to be a nightmare. It's not the houses it's the traffic and lack of proposals to avoid a huge back up of cars throughout the dat. PS It's the traffic!	Yes, sort the traffic issues out first and then build the houses!
Not much!	Diagrams / plan still vague. Roads not clear. No plans for traffic flow management. Not enough infrastructure. Poor engagement with residents for this event. Not accessible for those without transport - should do more locally	
Nil	Access to main roads will increase traffic in and out of L/worth and Hitchin. Why so few solar panels on the houses? Shop? Pubb? Community Centre?	
	High Dane and Highover are NOT to become main roads. They are unsafe. All access for cars and busses should be on Stotfold Road only. They are not wide enough.	Yes, main road = Stotfold. Compensation for Walsworth residents for when you make air quality poor and reduce the house prices.
Open spaces. Primary School.	Concerns about the traffic coming up the hill where we live (Highover and Sturgeons Way). How "affordable" is the housing for a single female earning around 40 000 a year - 30 years old. Currently I cant afford anything in the area which is sad as my family have lived here my whole life and I grew up here. I would like it NOT to be built. Shore your houses elsewhere. The roads simply cannot cope with this. 3 Million is a drop in the ocean as a sop to the council. Please see some sense. Consideration of traffic. Roadworks. Drainage to an already overloaded system - sewage. Nurseries and schools already have waitlists.	Don't build any houses here.
Nothing!!	750+ homes in an already overbuilt area. I now hate living where I do but have no choice due to my job / location property prices. Road far too congested. Polluted.	Build fewer houses.
Potential for another school. Business opportunity.	The amount of homes. Potential traffic added to our already over run roads. Potential noise pollution. More traffic on small side roads.	Don't build it.
	Sewage / waste water should not be pumped into Cambridge Road. It will make flooding that already occurs worse. Bus access to High Dane should not rely ona road narrowing. It requires rising bollards. No provision made still for residents from Rosehill ext to get out on to Stotfold Road. Social housing should be spread throughout the whole development not placed in one or two spots.	Waste water pumped direct to sewage works. Old settlement tanks or identical idea. Social housing to be spread over the whole site. Rising bollards for bus services.
Community spaced, parks, green areas	Public engagement comments in 1-3 appear to have been ignored with regard location of school and local centre and concentration of high density housing away from existing residents (High Dane, Armour Rise). The amount of additional traffic.	Alleviate traffic congestion - already too much congestion in this area.
Nothing. Thanks a lot!!!	The houses on 4a + 4b are being built on land higher than Grovelands Ave. These proposed houses will all look directly into the gardens, kitchens, bedrooms!!!	Turn houses round so don't back onto Grovelands.

The layout and mix of green spaces/play areas looks attractive. Mix of house sizes is positive but could do with more smaller units. Style of building look nice.	More affordable homes, move community centre, so events impact the new homes it apparently serves, not, lots of rowdy footfall past existing homes. Affordbale homes mixed up not concentrated on 1 end of the development by existing homes.	Look at public engagement 1-3 and act on these!
	Increased traffic and how this will be managed is of concern . Hitchin is already very congested. Presumably the new building will not result in a "rat run" to other established housing areas. Will the local doctors be able to cope with increased numbers of patients. Also how will other local health services cope?	Hitchin already needs a by-pass!! Perhaps need a wider range of smaller units to encourage young people to the town. More affordable would be welcome.
	No doctors surgery. Traffic impact to Cambridge Road and going into town/station. Negative impact on wildlife in the area - variety of birds, bats etc. is high and could be heavily impacted. Noise. Reduced privacy.	Our property backs on to the boundary of the proposed new homes and we need to know who to contact about this as the hedgegrow and trees are very overgrown and haven't been tended since we moved in 5 years ago. This is impacting our fences. Please can we be contacted about this ASAP.
	The proposals do not outline the wide traffic plans for managing the increased vehicle traffic beyond the development footprint, especially toward the AIM and under the railway bridge by station. How have the number of affordable homes been decided on the development? is this through local need? Will displaced Hitchin residents be considered in the first instance or displaced London problems?	Noting the current developemtn on Forester country by Leister Hospital and now this developemtn thow will traffic be managed joining the junction. What is the integrated transport plan?
	Pretty boards! But too many houses for this area. Concerned about the infrastructure which is already overloaded - gas, electricity, water etc. Must have provision for disabled people with proper access and facilities. NHDC provision of 10% is not enough. As with most residents in this area I am deeply concerned about the impact of extra traffic in an already congested area. 700 houses = 700+ cars! Try getting out onto Stotfold Road and Cambridge Road at 08h30am now! The cycle path proposed to come out in Armour Rise. Very concerned about anti social behaviour. Also concerned about all the extra traffic + impact of so many new home on the NHS services such as already overloaded GP practices I am surprised people still want garages. It seems like a waste of space if cars are parked in front. Are any of the houses terraced? Is there a casement that prevents people converting their garages? As a daily commuter on Stotfold road, the inconveniences caused by this and the effects it will have on the future will be very problematic for many people from both Hitchin and Letchworth. As a town Hitchin does not have the infrastructure to support its current amount of residents, thousands or more people would only add more to their crisis. While I understand everyone is in the business to make money, what has happened to this site is another instance of struggling business owner being bullied into selling up land. This land is prime agricultural land and this site permanently takes it out of our food production. Not sustainable. More CSS10 could be provided for the green spaces. There is certainly room for much more. Do not like. Not enough affordable houses. Too much traffic.	Keep people updated on matters related to the estate.

against the proposed development. We believe it will strain our resources, worsen traffic, and overcrowd our community. However, if we're to find any positives in this situation, here are my suggestions to make the best of a bad situation for Holt:

Improve internet speeds, for example in Little Parks, where they're currently inadequate at 26 Mbps.

Reconsider the location of the attenuation pond to prevent future road expansion and instead use the space for housing, protecting neighbouring fields.

Take steps to preserve the habitat of the local deer population to ensure they're not disturbed or displaced.

To block off the road between Great Parks and Little Parks for incoming development traffic to maintain the quiet roads on Little Parks.

Introduce bat houses to the builds.

Avoid installing street lights to minimise light pollution and preserve the natural darkness of our surroundings.

Establish a safe cycling path or route to Bradford on Avon to encourage sustainable transport.

Implement traffic calming measures throughout the village, such as a give-way system, to address speeding.

The consultation is not adequate. There is very little detail about the development, for example architecture or building materials. This is a large scale development for a village the size of Holt, and this consultation is not appropriate for having a real engagement with the views of the community.

There is no attempt to safeguard views across the valley or landscape.

There is no central green area.

Building styles and materials should link to this village which has a large number of local stone properties. It is not appropriate to plonk generic houses in this location which is a breach of the Wiltshire Design Guide.

The estate plan looks reasonable. My main concern about the development is the visual impact it will have on the approach from Melksham. Every effort should be made to keep a low profile looking into the estate from the road which seems to be the case in the plans presented and so any attempt to alter that adversely during the detailed planning process should be resisted.

village. You may have legally acquired the land. However, the availability of this land was the result of a corrupt process undertaken by Peter Collins, Wiltshire Council and Gladman. It has been contested by local residents at all stages but to no avail. Wiltshire Council appears to have signed a section 106 agreement that brings almost no benefit to Holt directly. So you'd better make a good job of it and we will fight you all the way to make sure that Holt is protected. Now for a few suggestions..... 1/If you want to see a decent job you need look no further than the recent Glove Factory development in Holt that was completed sympathetically and to the highest standards. I would suggest you send your planners and architects there before you submit your detailed plans and take note. 2/In order to protect residents of Great Parks, Little Parks and children accessing the primary school from increased traffic volumes when the new development is completed, I will be requesting that bollards are fitted at the top of Great Parks. There is a recent precedent for doing this on Holt Road Bradford on Avon when a new housing development took place. I would urge you to support the proposal. It would remove a point of likely conflict with residents. Bike and cycle traffic could continue unhindered. 3/I use the footpath across this land regularly. I hope that you will wish preserve and enhance this route. It could even be part of the BOA to Melksham Cycleway. I expect it to be completed to a very high standard. I am very concerned that the contractor who is currently fencing the site is about to block access to the footpath! Please can you take action to prevent this happening now! 4/This is currently the edge of the village. It is a field

Thank you for sending through the mass-produced circular that so could easily have been binned as junk mail. Smart move to try to go under the radar, for a lot of people. Didn't work here though. I assume you are planning something more substantial with regards to a community liaison, as there are a lot of people in the village with grave concerns about your development. There is plenty of time within the appeal decision conditions for positive pre-application conversations to take place. Please ensure you liaise with us between now and June.

Gladman's outline plans denoted a complete lack of local knowledge and they didn't take kindly to us raising our objections either. I am hoping Bewley Homes will get to know the community and work with the community to deliver their project to compliment Holt as a rural small village in the Wiltshire Countryside.

Please see below points to illustrate the community concerns:

1) the layout of the site shows the Holt56 footpath, but it is misleading to use any data from the outline plans to say people can easily walk to the village centre using it. (5.2 of TA 27/4/22) It states you can walk the Holt56 PRoW from the proposed site across the farm field via Bradley Lane, Station Road to cross the B3107 at the only safe pedestrian crossing to get to Holt Superstore in 10.33 minutes. I would be interested to hear back from any PR person from Bewley Homes/Turley who walks this in that time. It is ludicrous that the Holt56 PRoW was put forward as a route for people on the site to use – break your ankle

I am writing as a resident of Holt, Wiltshire who strongly opposed the outline plans by Gladman Developments. While I still do not want an estate of 90 homes dumped outside the village boundary of Holt, I was hopeful that Bewley Homes would liaise with villagers on their feedback to make the best out of the situation we all find ourselves in. However so far, I can't see that happening. It is a shame as residents know building work will take place on the field and want to engage in feedback and conversations with our local knowledge.

Work with us, not against us.

One letter in the post with one site image and a phone call/email to send in comments is not sufficient for a pre-application community engagement due to the history of the planning application and appeal process of the site. Bewley and Turley should embark on a more supportive and inclusive community engagement to at least show some regard to the impact of the development. I would hate for Bewley Homes to just summarise everyone's feedback you receive and carry on regardless with plans that have already been put together. Engage with the vibrant community spirit in Holt where people look out for each other and help each other. Use this support positively by being proactive and show willingness to listen and work with the community of Holt.

My main points as a resident on the visual image shared by Bewley are as follows, in no particular order.

that will make any difference as you have ignored all decency and virtue in the development so far . . .

1. Holt is already a "ribbon development" which has been criticised by Wiltshire Council. This proposal will simply make it worse.

2. The public transport here in Holt ranges from dire to non-existent, and you are proposing to build on prime agricultural land - making this in two senses an unsustainable development regardless of the window-dressing ou promise.

3. Existing residents' primary concern in multiple surveys is thew amount of traffic passing though the village - the development will make it much worse.

4. The development is outside the policy boundary as laid out in the approved Neighbourhood plan. Bewley may have found a loophole, but that doesn't make it "right" ie you are riding roughshod over the clear views of the existing residents.

5. The access into Great Parks is a joke. Those roads and the residential neighbourhood they pass through are not adequate or safe for the anticiapted voume of traffic and the juntion with the main road is already dangerous.

6. Bewley's track record in terms of preservation of hedges at the nearby development in Hilperton/Trowbridge is awful and I cannot believe your promises in that respect.

7. I quote "The provision of Section 106 funding, which can go towards a wide range of local community infrastructure including healthcare, education facilities and highways improvements.". Please name ONE case where Holt will be the benficiary of this. I am waiting . . .

the country, not taking into account specifically the style of Holt village & the fact it has a Conservation Area.

2. Your Illustration is so general a GCSE student could produce a more detailed drawing. It is very difficult to be able to discern the various properties, styles & their impact on what will become one of the gateways to our village.

3. There are no details of height elevations. In Switzerland poles are erected prior to planning agreement being decided so those who will be most impacted have an opportunity to see exactly what any construction will look like.

4. Your Illustration identifies a very small Play Area. For 90 homes, many of which will be homes to families the play area is inadequate at best. There are also no details of any play equipment to be provided so smaller children can play locally rather than walk to the other end of the village to use the Playground on our Recreational Field. Not an ideal situation for parents or children. And who will maintain said play equipment.

5. Monies paid to Wiltshire for Trowbridge Schools will not help the children of Holt, of whom a tiny percentage attend any Trowbridge school. Most children in Holt go to Holt VC primary, St. Lawrence in BoA, Corsham Secondary School, Haywood Prep & Senior School & Stonor school. This is ineffectual for the residents of Holt.

6. The traffic entering & leaving Great Parks at rush hours in particular does not appear to have been addressed, causing huge traffic jams especially when children are going to & leaving school. A recipe for a child being injured by cars etc.

consultation is extremely short. In addition the details you have provided regarding your proposals are very sketchy even with the addition information on this consultation page, especially when I am led to believe you intend to make a full planning submission in May which means your proposals must be fairly advanced. Taking these factors into account I cannot believe this is a meaningful consultation with the village but merely a 'tick box' exercise.

Having said that I would make the following comments on the details you have provided:

- 1) Under Benefits of the scheme you state it will deliver new market and affordable houses to met local housing needs, but recent housing surveys have shown there is no local housing need above that already being provided for.
- 2) You say a further benefit will be Section 106 funding, however as I understand it the vast majority of that funding is going outside of Holt to areas that are not affected by this development. How is that equitable for the people of Holt especially as they are the ones that will have to live with your 3 year construction period.
- 3) You state you will be creating green open spaces, however your development will result in a net loss as you will be building on what is at present green open countryside.
- 4) You stress you will retain existing trees and hedgerows on the site yet you have already removed long established hedges on the site and you have not even started construction yet!
- 5) You state the buildings will be energy efficient yet they are not being built to Passivhaus standards and neither do Exit on main road at very narrow part of through road, parking on street making road like a chicane. No medical centre therefore more strain on Melksham services. Bus service inadequate. Increase of traffic in and around Holt would increase on street parking particularly near the primary school.

It would be useful to see consideration given to connecting Holt to surrounding villages by footpath e.g extending the footpath to reach Broughton Gifford or creating new paths to allow easier access to BOA. It would also be highly advantageous to see greater priority given to cyclists and implementation of cycle markings along the main road between Melksham, BOA and Staverton including the overall reduction in speed limits.

have been hoped for, and am grateful to Bewley for that. The design of the houses appears sympathetic to the locality, and the layout of good quality. However, there are a number of issues regarding the proposal that are disappointing - there's no mention of the impact on, or improvements to, the village of Holt. Specifically: Walking access. Holt has narrow roads in a poor state of repair, equally poor pavements, and is renowned for issues with speeding drivers. There is also a lack of road crossings for pedestrians (the nearest crossing is approximately half a mile from the site). People will always look to take the shortest route from A to B, that is a route fraught with danger, especially for parents with children and the elderly. The consultation website makes no mention of the work that is to be undertaken to improve access / reduce risk. The original proposal suggested a footpath cutting from the bottom of the development to the end of Bradley Lane, providing safe (but further) access to the village centre, the school and other amenities. This was widely condemned at the time as being nigh-on unachievable due to the nature of the land to be crossed and narrowness at points on the route, but it would at least be viable for some residents without risking life and limb crossing busy roads. However, again, there is no mention. There's also no mention of infrastructure: no mention of improvements to public transport, no mention of improved non-vehicle access to surrounding villages and towns, no mention of e.g. high-speed broadband. There's no detail regarding the section 106 funding. Are

Melksham Road site (reasons were well documented!), I had accepted that it was to go ahead but remained fearful for the impact on the value and enjoyment of my own home and the village as a whole.

Some of my fears have been allayed by consultation with Bewley and plans being altered in consideration of the impact on the nearest neighbours. I feel that there are still elements of the development that could be improved to mitigate negative impact on the village and the environment.

I still feel strongly that adding a second entrance onto the Melksham Road would be more appropriate than the current, single entrance plan. This option would be safer for residents of Great and Little Parks and pedestrians and road users throughout the village. A Melksham Road entrance would necessitate the 30 mph zone being pushed back further to reduce traffic speeds and the entrance to the village (junction with Great Parks), making the junction safer and potentially less congested by giving residents choices.

I was disappointed to read that the section 106 has been allocated to Trowbridge secondary schools - of which, over the last 7 years, only around 1% of children have gone on to from Holt Primary School (over 60% have gone to St Laurence in Bradford on Avon, 30% to The Corsham School in Corsham, the remainder to Bath or independent schools). And early years funding has been allocated to Bradford on Avon instead of Holt and it is hard to make many comments due to the vague, almost meaningless, nature of many of the claims. However;

1) Access via Great Parks. This will greatly increase use of the junction with the B3107; what provision is envisaged to prevent this junction becoming congested at peak times, especially with vehicles turning right from the main road onto Great Parks. Great Parks does not seem suitable for heavy construction traffic, so this will cause great inconvenience (for three years, by your own estimate!) to residents of that street while development is going on.

2) I note that hedges along Great Parks have already been grubbed up, which is hardly in keeping with your environmental claims. This gives me no confidence at all in any of your statements. I note that solar panels, fitted already to many houses in the area with a southerly aspect, make no appearance here, so again I have no confidence in any of your environmental claims without real details.

3) Every time a development like this is proposed for the area, grand statements about affordable housing are made, yet amazingly little such housing ever appears. I suspect this will just be more of the same, overpriced badly built houses aimed at the second buyer.

major issues require to be resolved to allow for safe and controlled access to the new development and in Little Parks via Great Parks.

I would like to propose a safe and effective way to route the new and proposed traffic into a solution acceptable to both parties, as there will be a minimum of 90++ cars needing access morning and evening . At this time buses are mainly non-existent in Holt. Families accessing the doctors in Trowbridge and Bradford on Avon will be forced to use cars. This will create a minimum of two danger zones.

The road through from Great Parks into Little Parks and access from the main road. I propose putting a barrier across the road in Great Parks after the second house from the main road where the Gate into the development will be. It will be constructed in such a way that bicycles and people will still be able to get through but no cars. This will ensure that traffic is directed and forced onto the main road through Holt which will alleviate the danger of cars trying to access from the main road through Little Parks.

The second danger zone is the main access road which needs to start from the beginning of the Holt village a few hundred metres down from its present position, This will allow drivers to slow down before they reach the entrance to Great Parks. A suggested milage of 20 miles an hour with a few bumps to slow the race into the village which is a source of great concern to the existing residents. It will allow you to put a crossing for pedestrians across the road safely. Holt is a village and not a major highway to Bradford on Avon. This will help to dissuade unnecessary Homes should be energy efficient with EPCs of at least an A, with solar panels, heat pumps and electric car charging points. This is 2024, gas boilers should not be being installed!

Homes should have outdoor storage for bikes/garden furniture. Do not include garages as they're only kept for storing stuff, and the space could be used for bigger gardens!

The layout, including roads should be to the standard of the local highway authority so they can be adopted.

The appearance of the new homes should fit in with the village aesthetic, especially with Great Parks, using reconstituted stone that is used throughout that street.

Thank you for this invitation to provide feedback on the proposal. I agree that the village needs more housing to make it more affordable for families and to ensure the viability of village amenities. That said, I would appreciate the following concerns being addressed:

1. Holt is already afflicted by large volumes of inappropriately fast traffic coming through the village. This development will add to the daily volume, therefore please could Bewley work with Wiltshire to install traffic calming measures on Melksham Road in order to improve road safety, especially for children and elderly residents?

2. Holt is frequently surrounded by flooding, which this development will add to (despite the natural drainage mentioned in the proposal). More detail about flood protection (including trees, reservoirs and soak ways) would be appreciated.

3. Section 106 money has been allocated to Broughton Gifford school but not Holt. This makes no sense given the location of the development as Holt will be the natural feeder school for most. Please can this be re visited?

4. Whilst additional play areas would be appreciated, it would be more cost effective if Bewley fund improvements of the existing playground and recreational facilities near the village hall rather than installing a brand new facility.

5. Please consider protected walk/cycle ways away from This site is outside the village boundary and contravenes the village plan. Already Holt suffers from too many houses and all facilities are at breaking point. Another 90 houses will put a tremendous strain on the already stretched facilities, schools, medical care, gas and electricity etc. There is a huge problem with flooding building on more open land that helps to absorb rainfall with exacerbate this problem.

of affordable homes statement. Genuinely affordable housing is what is needed, but new developments in this area have been anything but. A £ figure is important.

- The FAQs states that the development will include five-bedroom homes. This hardly seems to be where the housing market has a gap. Young people in Wiltshire can't afford and don't need five-bedroom homes. They need smaller houses they can afford.
- With a growing population, 90 new homes will add on upwards of 250 residents to Holt. What has been considered to support infrastructure? Where will people access healthcare? How will the school cope? Services are already extremely stretched.
- When discussing mitigation measures to minimise impact on the local highway network, the answer is "Potential impacts of new residents will have been considered at the Outline stage." What is the Outline Stage? "Will have been" implies this has already happened. Did we have an opportunity to review this? What were the outcomes? What are the proposed "local highway improvements"?
- This answer also references "measures to support walking and cycling." This, to me, indicates the lack of knowledge of the site. Holt is a rural village, and beyond the village there are no pavements. Cycling to Melksham and Bradford is just about possible, but walking is not.
- There is a reference to a Travel Plan. Where will this be publicised? How can residents review and feed back on this?
- Biodiversity. Under FAQs, it states "The development will strive to deliver a net-gain for Biodiversity". BNG of at least 10% is now a requirement for development in

While I am very disappointed this unnecessarily and potentially detrimental developing is going ahead, if it is to happen I would like to be sure it will be a good development. What is meant by areas for play? Will there be specific children's play areas etc, and will they be better than the pathetic single slide with no way of access that seems to pass for the play area in the tannery development. Also, what specific things are being done to encourage nature? What types of tree will be planted (native hopefully?), perhaps a wildlife pond and/or meadow area could be considered?

1. Of course I don't like the loss of a green space outside the village boundary, but, if it must be so, then I would want stronger wording than 'strive' in connection with bio-diversity gains. I think it is really important to provide assurances that the on-site planting etc be really well-planned and not just a fairly random selection of trees and other plants. I think it would be important that there be guarantees that the work not be considered finished until the natural features were established.

2. I am still concerned that the junction on to the main road looks unsafe. Clarity about what the sight lines actually will be is crucial. I would not want the rest of the estate to become a rat-run because the junction is too difficult to negotiate.

3. My own view is that the proposed housing look pretty dull but maybe it's what is wanted. We do have a development in the village where a bit more imagination has been used. Architecture can change!

4. I have no idea what the wider village will gain from this development but cycle lanes which allow safe connections to at least Trowbridge would be excellent. In addition, negotiating the reopening of a train station in the village would be of great value in selling the houses I'm sure and for the rest of the village's green credentials.

My interest in the project is primarily focused on landscaping and tree planting. I'm keen that any plants/trees planted are done so appropriately so they grow and mature adding to the softening of the estate. Many developers plant trees and then leave them to wither and die as insufficient preparation/consideration was made. I'm particularly keen that the view from the road entering Holt is softened as the estate removes what is today a pleasant country view which is a real loss to the village.

thankyou for raising the consultation.

(1) for the transport plan can I suggest a bicycle/walking path along the N boundary of the development (S side of the hedge) and exiting to the road in your NE corner. On the plan it looks like there would be space for this. This would give Holt residents half of a safe active travel link direct to the Broughton Gifford corner. It should make it more likely the Council would be able to complete the remainder of that link adjacent to the road, perhaps with some of your Section 106 contribution. Alternatively, at minimum a walking/cycling exit in your NE corner to establish a through route for active travel, especially cycling.

(2) If there is any opportunity to improve connectivity of the footpath network this would also be much appreciated. For example re-aligning the NE extension of the path crossing the site to meet the Broughton Gifford corner. Perhaps you don't own this field, but you may have some influence or opportunity to negotiate with the neighbouring landowner.

(3) During construction it would be appreciated if you could keep the area informed in advance regarding amount of noise and vehicle movements per day.

(4) Your site plan is cryptic for readers outside the industry and could be made more accessible for consultation purposes. No key is provided.
I live not too far away from this site. Although this project has been very controversial with Holt residents, I want to ask what are the benefits this will bring to the village? For example, Melksham end of the village has always suffered from a particularly poor Internet connection.... would residents at the top end of the village be able to benefit from better connectivity seeing as they will be the ones most affected by your construction?

Hi.

We live very near the new development in Holt.

We were wondering if there could be any improvement to the WiFi in the area, which is really poor at this end of the village. Anything we would connect to also?

Many thanks.

Would it be possible to make the access to the development via a mini roundabout on the main road ? ,this would be extremely helpful in reducing the speed of traffic entering the village.

The development seems well thought out and would definitely help the economy of the Village.