

DROP IN RESPONSES RECEIVED – 22TH MAY – 22TH JUNE 2023

22 FEEDBACK RESPONSES TO SITE 1A

1. With Regards to the football field and associated land I feel there is very little that the Football club can do, although we will do everything we can to continue playing at the Park. There is no help forthcoming from Wiltshire FC, there seems few options available.

The best option would be if the Village, Parish council could buy the land for the Village. Unless the Sassoon Trust will give an idea of the value, they wish to achieve from the sale of the land then it is almost impossible to start to fund raise. If they wish to sell as development land, then I suspect it will be very high.

I believe the PC have written to the Sassoon Trust asking for their valuation on the land. It seems to me you are making all the right moves, by engaging with as many villagers as possible.

I am happy to put out a statement or attend meetings regarding this matter where I can.

2. The Cricket Club would like the PC and the village as a whole to make every effort to secure the land and sports pitches for the use of the village. Cricket has been played in the village since about 1870, and with it's connection to Siegfried Sassoon, it is a ground of historical significance.

Anyone passing will see cricket of some kind being played most evenings, and it especially a hive of activity on Sunday mornings as we host our juniors. Currently the Club has close to 100 children and their families, as well as cricket for adult Men and Women.

The Club does not want any houses on Site 1A

The Club does not want a Village Hall on Site 1A

If in the future a Sports Pavilion to serve the FC and CC can be funded, this would be welcomed

3. I would support reasonable plans to preserve the village playing fields, as I am sure others would and look forward hearing from You/the Parish Council accordingly.
4. The football and cricket clubs are vibrant and a vital part of the village.
5. I would dearly like to protect site 1a and keep the sports fields as sports fields for the following reasons;

Historical value & protection of the trees (I think Siegfried Sassoon would turn in his grave if he new the possibility of his beloved cricket pitch being built on)

My worry about new builds being so close to St John's historic listed buildings. Building on greenfield not brown field sites

Impact on the 'protected' village

Impact of neighbours opposite in Park Street

Impact on Dr Surgeries etc

Area of ANOB / Conservation area SAC /SSSI / Pollution into the River Wylfe

6. I support positive action to retain the playing fields as a continuing, thriving asset to the village. At a time when the government is actively encouraging local people to use green areas in their community for their enjoyment, hopefully the WC could be asked to contribute to protect a recreational area which is fully utilized and enjoyed.

The land also has enormous historical value, and all effort should be made to conserve it as a tribute to Siegfried Sassoon. However, I do not support the building of more housing.

I agree that our stunning football and cricket pitches with historic links to Sassoon and the Heytesbury Estate should be protected for future generations. I fully support the idea of creating a community trust to buy, enhance and run the 'Sassoon Memorial Fields' and agree that Lottery grants, trusts and

other routes as a means to raise the necessary funds should be explored. However, it is difficult to estimate how big a challenge this might be until we know the approximate cost of buying the land. You state that the owners of the sports pitches have decided to put their land up for sale on the open market, but this does not seem to have happened, otherwise I am sure the council would have further details. If we know this is going to happen, it strikes me that the Parish Council should approach the owners (after all they are not strangers) to discuss the possibility of the village buying it. Without knowing its value it is difficult for funding options to be considered. The possibility of purchasing the sports pitches land for the village should be separated from the discussions regarding building a village hall and houses.

7. I do not agree with new housing, On the other hand, I would support any moves to acquire and preserve the area north of Park Street for sports and recreation. I would not object to the provision of a small, sports-oriented pavilion in the appropriate area
8. As far as I could gather, you are anticipating that the Sassoon Trust are wishing to sell some of their land they hold in Heytesbury. It would be wonderful if they could release the cricket/football pitch for the £190,000 that I think you said was the sum that the Raymond Hall Trust was holding which would mean that the Village would have this land in perpetuity. A small pavilion with changing rooms would also be ideal. I realise that this is probably living in cloud cuckoo land but it is a lovely thought.
9. Thank you for your time on Thursday, I found it most interesting.

My understanding taken from the consultation is that the green parkland in the centre of the village, being our sports/recreation area is to go on the market, fee unknown and that the PC is requesting ideas and views of what villagers would like to do, also for folk to put forward their names and contact details to assist, the PC would be unable to do what needs to be done on their own.

If the collective village was in agreement and was able to raise the funds to purchase the land for it to remain as a place for recreation, that, in my opinion would be perfect but naïve. We are opposed to an estate being built in the centre of the village and cannot understand why we still need to build 25 new homes when the number of new homes being currently built in Warminster should surely negate the need to build in the surrounding areas.

Our green spaces need to be protected.

10. I do not support any activity by the Parish Council to facilitate or encourage the Sassoon Trust to submit planning applications for this land.
11. We do wish to support attempts to preserve the Playing Fields and community space North of Park Street and agree with many neighbours, that utilising the Raymond Trust fund along with additional fund raising and grant seeking, to achieve that would be something we would support.

The FPWG and PC rehashing failed previous development proposals, and approaching the landowner with such ideas, will only serve to inflate Heytlands view of the value of the fields.

These values should be considered in light of their current and future status, as agricultural and amenity lands. Such valuation might well then be within the reach of the village to raise funds for!

12. I am not opposed to protecting the playing fields, but this is something that can be done alone and without the need to destroy the environment of the village with these pet projects. There is funding available from the Raymond trust as well as grants from a wide range of public bodies to support protection of green spaces. There are also a number of charitable organisations that specialise in the protection of green spaces who can assist.
13. I do support attempts to preserve the Playing Fields and community space North of Park Street and agree with many neighbours, that utilising the Raymond Trust fund along with additional fund raising and grant seeking, to achieve that would be something we would support. There are all sorts of grants, community funding, investment, Sport England etc that could work together to buy this land. If it is put up for sale at the agricultural or recreational value that is currently its. To start talking about % uplifts for potentially development is quite

frankly ridiculous, without any planning permissions. Someone with the skill to negotiate a proposed land sale is essential.

14. If what we are being told is correct and the land is definitely going on the open market then I would fully support any efforts to buy the land for the village but not at the expense of housing especially south of Park Street.
15. We feel that for the long-term good of the village, all efforts should be made to retain the sports pitches and recreational space in the 1A area

We have no direct involvement in sport in the village but have participated in the organising of village events that were allowed to run with the permission of the landowners. The parkland is of great value to both young and old and is a welcome 'green space' in a village that is rapidly filling areas free of buildings.

Visiting sports teams bring financial gain to the shop and pub.

16. I think the sports fields are very important, they have heritage and historical importance, both sports clubs are successful and we must find a way to keep them going for the future, I am not against limited housing, we need young people to be able to stay living here, otherwise we will lose our school, I support the parish council in what it can do to help.
17. We think that the value of the sports pitches and parkland is immense and should be available to the village as recreational space - we have no other village green.
18. Affordable housing is needed to keep young people in the village, instead of one big estate, why not build a few houses in different places such as either side of Park St sites 1A & 1B
19. The sports fields must be protected
20. Sports fields as ?? not much use to the village
21. We have to find a way to protect the sports fields for the future
22. Removal of the sports fields – has thought gone into what the young people in the village would do and Heritage and sense of identity brings to a village.

Both football and cricket teams from youth to veterans represent the village in and outside of the county. To lose this advertising and village awareness, would be too ?? to the positioning of the village in the county.

Has any work been done exploring the option of supporting agencies such as lottery, MCC, FA and sport England, to not only maintain the facility but to enhance it to be a landmark of what could be achieved, there is huge potential to develop this area of the village.

It has been proven to lose playing fields is detrimental to physical and mental health of young people. We need to be aware of how such facilities promote so much in communities, that is only measurable in decades to come.

With limiting facilities such as this for young people, will reduce the attraction for young people and hence increase the demographic of the village.

19 FEEDBACK RESPONSES TO SITE 1B

1. If new housing is necessary, the Cricket Club does not have a view to which site is most suitable/ appropriate to meet any needs.
The Club does not want a Village Hall on Site 1B
2. I am very strongly against any building on Greenfield/Flood plain land and/or anything near the River Wylfe which must all be preserved according to their Conservation Area protection and SSSI/SAC status, as has been my consistent position on this matter.

I see that the Wylfe Valley Farmers Environmental Cluster Group will be sampling the River Wylfe to assess pollution levels for phosphates, nitrates, Wessex Water storm overflows and septic tanks, which clearly demonstrates a concern about the ecosystem from others

3. I live on Park Street and would object to planning on the following basis.

The flood plain on the other side to the cricket pitch is exactly that, even this year it flooded and was like a swamp and all that would happen it would flood and there would be uninsurable houses anyway.

4. I object to any thought/proposal for the new builds on site 1b for the following reasons; Greenfield, 1b is a **Flood plain** (residents have evidence of the last few years and how badly the fields flood)

Conservation area SAC / ANOB /SSSI Impact on wildlife/butterflies, Impact of 'protected' village, too close to the River Wylye with *high risk* of pollution into the river and impacting the wildlife. Thanks for your time today

5. Thank you for the opportunity to put forward views concerning the future of our village. To contemplate using greenfield sites backing onto the river is going against all environmental standards. To build on a flood plain in a known flood risk area and on a protected river is totally wrong.
6. There is strong dissent in some quarters for both building a village hall and houses on the Sassoon land.
7. I thought the plan for any houses South of the park had been withdrawn by the Sassoon Trust as they knew Wiltshire Council would turn it down, due to the flood plain amongst other things.
8. I remain firmly opposed to any building development on the land south of Park Street.

The reasons why I believe this to be undesirable were well covered in 2018 (the last time there was a planning application for development on this land) and I do not intend to go over all the objections in this email, save to say my main concern remains the flood risk associated with building on this land. Any development would either be on Flood Zone 3 land or be immediately adjacent to that land. Water would be displaced that is currently soaked up by the land and this will add to the flood risk that is already very high for many properties in the village houses on Park Lane and the houses situated on the water front, both upstream and downstream. Recent experience (Jan 2023) in Bishopstrow shows the increased incidence of properties flooding when new development interfere with the historical water-courses and water meadows. I do not want the Council to link the purchase of the playing fields or construction of a village hall with the development of land south of Park Street.

9. I am writing to you to let you know that I am also opposed to any building development on the south side of Park Street Heytesbury.

I made my feelings clear when I objected to the plans in 2018 when there was a planning application for the development of this land. I still believe that it would be irresponsible to build on land which is on flood zone 3 as shown on the environment agency's flood map. One third of the field is in flood zone 3. Any building in the proposed field would make the surrounding area more susceptible to flooding and a great risk to sewage leakage directly into the River Wylye. We have photographic evidence showing large water courses flowing from many areas of the field, onto neighbouring land, streams and into the river. Heytesbury is not connected to mains sewage so there is a strong possibility that sewage would flow directly into the adjacent stream and into the River Wylye and threaten the wildlife and fish if houses were built in the field.

I confirm that both my husband and I object to your building proposals as we feel that the site is totally unsuitable land for building on.

10. We are opposed to developing the land south of Park Street (1B) and will continue to object and resist any and all such ill-conceived proposals put forward to Wiltshire council in the future, as we have done in the past.

As will many more fellow villagers than the last time this was proposed, many have written to you on this recently and I hope you and the PC recognise the strong objection by the village to developing the land south of Park St.

- 11.** Many of these objectors will continue to resist and raise their objections to both you, the PC, landowners, and Wiltshire council, should any such plans be put forwards in the future.

The need to retain long established flood meadows to protect the community, its existing properties and owners, in resistance to ever more frequent flooding events, overrides any short term gain for landowners seeking to increase the value of it's holdings at the villagers expense.

This is demonstrated by events in both 2013 and most recently in February 2023 where flooding and waters raising significantly when the Wyle again breached its banks, led to serious risks, that demonstrated that any change, or compromise, to lands providing vital absorption of flood waters, should not be considered for future development.

- 12.** There are also a number of charitable organisations that specialise in the protection of green spaces who can assist. This is something you have not investigated and you should prioritise this long before you push development on wildlife protected flood plains outside of the village boundaries.

- 13.** I am opposed to developing the land south of Park Street (1B) and will continue to object and resist any and all such ill-conceived proposals put forward to Wiltshire council in the future, as was done in the past, in such numbers that WC had never before seen with regard to a rural housing proposal.

It is my understanding that many more fellow villagers will object to this than the last time this was proposed, and I hope you and the PC recognise the strong objection by the village to developing the land south of Park Street; as a sweetener to protecting the recreational land to the North of Park Street it is not a strong negotiating position, due to the vociferous objections that will be made to any planning application submitted. With regard to the recent flooding of properties in the High Street and the increased ground water south of Park Street in the water meadows and the general vicinity (not to mention Bishopstrowe, where the new houses being built were fine, but the existing row of houses on the other side of the road flooded for the first time ever.) I rest my case.

- 14.** The last two failed Sassoon plans for housing have contained the same old threat of losing the sports pitches and this time is no different.
- 15.** Not only will your plans ruin the village for property owners, the green spaces, trees, flora and fauna, it will also have a direct effect on the flood plain, services, traffic and overall health and safety.

Where will our waste-water go if you swamp the flood plain!

- 16.** The site is as we understand owned by the same landowners as the parkland. If it is possible, perhaps development on 1B with housing for young people from this area could be balanced with retention of the sports pitches and parkland.
- 17.** With climate change uncertainties ahead of us, to suggest that they should be built on the edge of the water meadow south of Park Street without an adequate mandate, which you do not have, is more than likely to be turned down by Wiltshire Council.

You well know that the Sassoon Trust abandoned the plan to do so because of the serious objections raised against this plan, which meant that it would almost certainly be turned down by Wiltshire Council. The water meadow is the lung of the village and an important area for wildlife, dog walking, etc., which must be preserved intact (trees are one thing but houses are quite another). I am strongly opposed to any plan to build houses in that area. Apart from anything else, the proposed site is too close to the river and, since we are not connected to the main drains, storm waters would inevitably result in sewage overflows running into the river.

- 18.** I didn't think there was anything wrong with the last plan.

- 19.** Affordable housing is needed to keep young people in the village, instead of one big estate, why not build a few houses in different places such as either side of Park St sites 1A & 1B

4 FEEDBACK RESPONSES TO SITE 2

1. If Site 2 is required for additional housing to meet future demands, the Cricket Club understands. The Club does not have a view to which site is most suitable/ appropriate to meet any needs. The Club does not want a Village Hall.

2. I would not oppose a plan to build affordable housing to the west end of the village and within the village envelope, provided;

firstly, that it was supported by the essential infrastructure it would need, by which I mean they would have to be connected to the main drains (12 houses at that end of the village are, I think, already connected so I believe that it should not be too much of a problem to connect more houses to the south of the road leading out of the village towards the Cotley Hill Roundabout) and also to the main gas grid (I hope that connection to the mains electricity would not present a problem); I assume too that the school could take the additional children the new houses would bring; and secondly, that they would be of the quality and in keeping with existing houses in the village. I suggest also that the new houses should be as 'green' as possible, as cheap to run as possible, and should come ready equipped with solar panelling.

3. I would have no objection to the field West of the Village, providing it was within the village boundary. It would be good if they were not of an estate nature but that is wishful thinking probably!
4. Village Hall on Site 2, Heytesbury is unusual in that it has No parish field, building, hall or anywhere to store its parish property (chairs, tables, signs, other stuff belonging to the parish).

Site 2 is central to the parish of Heytesbury, Tytherington and Knook - and there is room for adequate parking for sports and village functions.

33 FEEDBACK OTHER COMMENTS / ASPIRATIONS

1. The Village should remember that the park, containing both sports pitches, as well as grazing, is hugely accessed asset.

People exercising, walking their dogs or just meeting up, use the park on a daily basis throughout the year. It is both beautiful and charming and visiting teams and parents always comment on its charm. An asset worth preserving in every way.

2. I am currently in away and understand that there have been meetings regarding possible housing developments in Heytesbury and I wish to record my objection to this as it would impact the character of the village and would be an environmental risk to this protected conservation region. I am also surprised to see external entities involved in what is a very local matter.
3. It is beyond my comprehension how a very small number of Parish Councillors have managed to get themselves into a position where they think they can ride roughshod over the majority of villagers who are against the building of houses at the east end of the village.

Using the possibility of a free new village hall as bait is just ridiculous. The village already has the school hall, the hall at the St John's almshouse and soon, the back of the church which is being converted as an open space where social events can take place.

Surely it would be better for the village if the Raymond Hall money, at present tied up in the Charity Commission, could be legally acquired for the purchase of the sports pitches which would benefit the village for ever.

If a new village hall is built, I predict it would be bankrupt within a few years.

4. I am against any medium or even small-scale new housing developments which will impact our village and based on surveys carried out is the view of the village in general.
5. Unfortunately, due to work commitments I am unable to attend either of the briefings for the housing drop in this week. However, I have heard that you are willing to listen to comments and thoughts from local residents on their opinions. I write to reinforce my position originally

stated during the recent survey (Summer 22) opposing any housing developments within Heytesbury.

I have yet to see any compelling case or statistical evidence to suggest there is a requirement or more importantly any overwhelming support of the local residents that reflect a need for additional housing within the village. Indeed the results of the Summer 2022 Housing Needs Survey do not offer this evidence in fact I would suggest that the results of the survey indicate that the Parish do not wish their Parish Council to be driving forward with any aspirations or plans for further development.

I am surprised given the majority of the households are not in favour that the PC deem it appropriate to continue to force this issue when we live in a democratic society where the views and opinions of the electorate should be respected.

For the record both myself and my wife remain strongly opposed to any such developments.

6. The A36 and road access is already a dangerous turning and in the 15 years we have lived there have been many accidents and 2 fatalities-less traffic please.

There seem better options in our area for building.

Regards and thanks for all you do,

7. Following my visit today to the surgery I would like to express my views.

Firstly, I would as probably others in the village would like to know as well the exact number of houses we are looking at now after quite a few new (residential) dwellings and changes of use' have been granted and built/converted since WC allocated Heytesbury the number of 25. This number must have reduced, so I think this is a highly important fact that should be made public of how many houses we are talking about at this stage.

8. Heytesbury is a linear village contained in a boundary of very busy roads and a river.

We are very lucky to have a few small green areas within that boundary. It would be very detrimental to the village environment to clog these open areas with yet more housing.

The Warminster extensive multiple housing plans are already providing large scale housing developments which will impact on all immediate resources and infrastructure. Therefore, with these massive housing estates and the government stating that the mandatory housing targets have been made advisory there is no need for a housing development in Heytesbury .

Heytesbury, last year won 'Best Newcomer' in Wiltshire's Best Kept Village competition, let's keep our lovely village just the same.

9. Thank you for providing the update on the work of The Future Planning Working Group (FPWG) of the Parish Council in your Heytesbury Hub post. These are separate issues which seem to have been conflated by a certain section of our community in order to achieve their ulterior motives ie. house-building in Heytesbury as a means of monetising the Sassoon land which includes the sports pitches and the water meadow land opposite.

I am disturbed by the motives of the Parish Council when the various studies / aborted planning applications over the past few years clearly indicate that there is no village support.

Without a mandate from the villagers, why has The Future Planning Working Group (FPWG) be formed and what has prompted the need for the recent drop-in (consultation) events at the Red Lion?

I question what is driving the Parish Council's agenda when they are in receipt of the following evidence:

Parish Council Needs Survey, June 2019 (commissioned by the Parish Council) - this does not support the need for affordable housing in the Parish.

Wiltshire Council Local Plan, January 2021 - this does not support the requirement to build additional housing in Heytesbury and states that there must be proven need. In fact it stipulates compelling reasons for NOT building additional housing in Heytesbury (and more specifically on the Sassoon land) including that environmental and landscape considerations must not be compromised; the constraints of building on a floodplain / Area of Outstanding Beauty / habitat sites etc.

Housing Needs Survey, Summer 2002 - does not provide a majority mandate for driving any subsequent actions with regard to house-building.

The surveys indicate that this is not what the Parish wants, and the democratic views of the majority of households should be respected. The persistence of the Parish Council to drive through something that is not even within its remit or area of responsibility is puzzling and I think the village is due a clear and transparent explanation for what is driving its actions.

- 10.** Following your presentation in the Red Lion earlier this week, for which many thanks, I would like to make a number of comments, which are intended to be constructive, rather than confrontational:

With some 900 houses now going up in Warminster, there is no urgent obligation for a new build of 25 houses in Heytesbury. Wiltshire Council puts the figure of 25 houses against the village of Heytesbury, to be built over a period from 2016 to 2036, and nowhere does it require them to be built all at the same time nor necessarily on a single site. There is no reason therefore why this number should not include those houses which have recently been built in the village as infill with the balance being built in small numbers, as infill, over the next 13 years. I would be happy to accept the provision of affordable housing as infill within the village, but it must not extend outside the village envelope.

It was, I would suggest, a little unwise to put forward this plan, yet again, when it would never get the strong mandate needed to overcome all the obvious objections to it. All you have done is to stoke up further the resentment of a considerable proportion of those who live here.

- 11.** The proposal for the kind of oversized village hall previously put forward, such as the one which the Wiltshire Council has already turned down, or the one subsequently proposed in August 2018, would be a millstone round the necks of present and future generations of villagers.

It is not just a question of cost but, equally important is that of who would run it, and would they be able to keep it financially self-sustaining? There are too many existing village halls in adjacent villages to guarantee the availability of funding sources. And Codford's village hall is the prime example of what can go wrong if a village hall is too big for the needs of the village in which it is located, particularly when it has permanent bar facilities to rival and undercut any existing pub in the village. We are lucky to have one remaining pub, the Red Lion, and must never do anything to undermine its financial viability.

It is very unfortunate that the village hall, and various plans to pay for it, was presented in a way calculated to be divisive within Heytesbury.

- 12.** Thank you for organising yesterday's 'drop in' and showing plans. I know my husband has written a long email so I agree with what he has written and my thoughts briefly are below. I notice from your questionnaire Q5 11 said Yes and 22 said No relating to whether one would support discussions with local landowners to deliver the Parish's housing needs and I querying the PC being involved.

As for the houses that Heytesbury are supposed to build 25 for their quota, this has always been a debatable subject as timing seems to differ in that we have a 15 year period until 2036 to fulfil this and also the number involved. In your questionnaire comments to Q4 35 said No and 17 Yes with proviso that only affordable or for locals.

- 13.** Turning to the divisive subject of any Village Hall I am against any monies going towards this as it is not needed as the various questionnaires have proved. Whilst Q6 30 said Yes and 25 No, this is not a great overall majority.

We are lucky to have the Church in the centre of the village which has held Concerts, opera singers Billy Holly and the forthcoming ABBA - all of which the venue is free! As you know there are plans afoot to put in a kitchen, loo and new stacking chairs arriving for any event on Monday.

- 14.** Congratulations on the success of the Drop Ins.

They were very much a good idea and worked well in terms of disabling people being rude in a public meeting. I can't understand why some people can't see that they would be better off having **some** houses instead of waiting and getting lots!

It was very good that so many people came to the second one and good that some people were offering to help.

- 15.** Your interesting presentation gave me the opportunity, which I felt I had to take, to tell you something about how the schism within the village came about and how important it is that, somehow, we manage to break down some of the barriers within the village community.

I also feel passionate about this village of ours in which such wonderful events as our recent street party can take place. It is our home, and I love it when I can walk down the street and talk to everyone I meet. It's a difficult balance but, what I wanted to tell you was that, I am not opposed to more affordable housing nor to a village hall per se, but in the right places and of the most appropriate sizes. The increasingly bitter divisions within the village have been a nightmare for us all, We would dearly love harmony to descend upon this village of ours and, if there is any way you can help reduce the tensions in the village, you would bring huge benefit to the whole community.

- 16.** The conclusion I came to with the current Heytesbury situation is that what is really needed is a neighbourhood plan.

The neighbourhood planning process exposes all of the issues and aspirations around the present state of the community and future community development and allows people the opportunity to engage and have a voice in an open and consultative way. Out of this process might come an opportunity to form a CLT. A CLT is strengthened by the existence of an adopted neighbourhood plan.

- 17.** I have concerns associated with any development outside the current development boundaries for the village.

I know from speaking to many others in the village that there is a strong body of opinion that shares my views and concerns.

Have you and the PC definitively established these lands are for sale, and if so, what expected valuation has been determined for them?

- 18.** The village needs to keep young people here or in 30 years it will be a dead village, affordable housing should not cost more than £250,000
- 19.** Concerned not with building, but how they will connect to the sewerage & amenities, traffic could also be a problem.
- 20.** Village hall / sports pavilion all needed.
- 21.** Housing is inevitable, so we need to negotiate a deal that gives the village benefit
- 22.** Only realistic way to ensure a village hall and sports fields is an enabling development
- 23.** We need some new affordable housing to keep young families in the village- the school and local businesses need to be sustained
- 24.** We do not want housing but a pavilion and sports fields
- 25.** We would not want to lose green spaces, so understand careful planning needs to go ahead, a would be good to agree a combination of needs. Greenspaces for all ages 0-100 years, keep shop, pub and possibly a community centre. What would be the impact of traffic and extra people. Need a neighbourhood plan ASAP !
- 26.** The principal of constructive growth in the village does not deeply concern me as it is a need, what concerns me more, is ripping the heritage and heart of the village that will provide opportunities of friendship, memories and the future of our village.
- 27.** With regards to Wiltshire Councils Local plan – Empowering Local Communities – January 2021 – Which was used as justification for the rehash of the proposal to develop the land south of Park Street (site 1B).

This clearly states that any such developments should take place over 15 years, with a net figure of some 22 houses – potentially reduced further, as smaller plans in Heytesbury are approved and built over the next 13 years?

This document also had presumptions such as:

1. That the housing should not be outside the village building development boundary, - clearly the proposals put forward for the Heytlands land, north and south of Park Street contravene this?

2. Has to have the support of the local community evidenced by consultation – the latest Housing Needs Survey, you commissioned, from last year, clearly shows a majority, 66%, of those responding, do not want building allowed outside the village building boundary.
3. Must reflect a proven need – again the Housing Needs survey shows only 14% are in potential, not proven, housing need – also noting that Heytesbury already has significantly higher proportion of affordable housing than a typical Wiltshire village of its size.
4. It also states that the constraints of zero building on Flood Zones 2&3, in a green belt, outside the building boundary, in Habitat sites, or in areas of Specific Scientific Interest – all of which the land proposed falls into.

Further details and objections raised by the villagers, who you represent at the PC, clearly stated that 54% do not want their PC engaging with local landowners on building outside the village boundary.

28. In 2020, we moved to Heytesbury Village, and we invested in buying a home in the Village due to its location, its beauty, its Village life and for being in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

We disagree for the requirement of a new potential Housing Development/Estate and new Village Hall in Heytesbury Village, especially when any such development would be outside the Village Development Boundary. And we would certainly not support the Village Development Boundary being changed.

Proposed New Housing Estate, Our concerns and objections are as follows –

1. Is this Housing Development Legally required?
2. There is, as far as we are aware, no current Government Guidelines re numbers of new developments that must be created within Wiltshire. Can you confirm if you are in possession of any new figures?
3. We invested into Heytesbury Village as it was and have no desire to have a Housing Estate developed within the Village.
4. There have been several figures banded about recently - 25/23/11/09. Is this specifically for Heytesbury or for Warminster?
5. If planning permission was granted, would the properties be for the Families of Heytesbury only.
6. Pressure on the Infrastructure of Heytesbury/Warminster amenities.
7. Pressure on an already struggling NHS.
8. Pressure on Transport and Roads.
9. Business Structure in Heytesbury. We have a Post Office come Shop and The Red Lion both running as a business. There are no other Visual Businesses within Heytesbury itself. Therefore, why not support the Red Lion using their facilities. They have the facility to hold functions of which they have held many. They are the Hub of the community.
10. There is no NHS Dentists available. BUPA is only taking "private" patients at a great cost.
11. Education. Heytesbury Church of England Primary School. Ofsted completed an Inspection on the Primary School on the 13th and 14th March 2023. Their findings were "Overall effectiveness requires improvement". Therefore, would this school be a viable choice for any newcomers to the Village?
12. Has a Housing Survey been completed and/or or is it near to its expiry date? Consideration for a new Survey to be completed. Is the Survey just for the Residents of Heytesbury and not persons who work within the Village?
13. Do the new Housing Estates that surround Heytesbury Village not meet a percentage that is apparently required by Government? For example, the large development on the Northwest side of Warminster and the Boreham Road development.

Proposed New Village Hall

1. We oppose the idea of a new village hall. We certainly do not want under any circumstances to allow a Housing Developer to use the building of a Village Hall in return for the granting of planning permission for a new housing development/estate.

2. We understand that there are already five (5) Village Halls within a Five (5) mile radius of Heytesbury Village. Are these Village Halls financially viable or are they struggling?

3. Why do we need a New Village Hall?

4. If Planning Permission was obtained for a new Village Hall, who would –

- Take responsibility for it. And would it be a voluntary role, or would that person be paid?
- Maintain both the property and Land and at what cost would this be at?
- Who would pay for the maintenance of the proposed Village Hall?
- Who would take responsibility for the security?
- Where would the finances come from to support the proposed new Village Hall?
- Why not just update the current Changing Room on the Football/Cricket Pitch.

In summary, we have tried to look at the proposals in an objective manner but can find no benefit to any large development to our lovely village that would be of benefit to us or any other present resident.

Lastly, we would like to thank you and the others that have put such an effort into the presentations that were given

29. Further to the recent drop in session at the Red Lion, I wanted to share my feedback on the proposal being put forward by the PC.

I object to the proposals presented as they are using rumour and scare mongering to give reason to actions that have no basis in fact. Several points are concerning about this proposal:

1. Expenditure of tax payers money to push forward a proposal based on rumour is a waste of public funds and shows poor moral standards being driving by the PC. The use of threat and danger to push parishioners to accept these proposals is arrogant disrespectful to the Parish overall.
2. It clear that facts had been ignored from your own housing survey last year and in 2019. You have no remit to push this development on the basis of those surveys
3. **Parish Housing Needs Survey** - June 2019. Commissioned by the PC, carried out by Wiltshire Council.

The statistics in that document do not support the need for affordable housing in the Parish. Based on 450 households and a response rate of 129 replies so 33.2% response rate.

1. 11 households (out of 450) were in "housing need" based on average Wiltshire earnings of £28,329pa. This is 2.4% of the Parish
 2. 2 households were on the Wiltshire Council Housing Register. This is 0.4% of the Parish.
 3. In the 2011 Census there were 57 social houses in the parish, which is 16.3% of total housing Wiltshire affordable housing average is 14.7%, so the Parish has more than the WCC average.
 4. In addition the Parish has affordable rents at St John's Almshouses and the long term rents for tenants from the Heytesbury Estate would be classed as being more affordable than open market rates.
 5. It states that there is a low level of turnover of social housing in the Parish. But that is the same in the private rental and private housing market; not much comes on to any of these markets due to Heytesbury being a small and sought after village.
4. **Wiltshire Council Local Plan** - "Empowering Local Communities" - January 2021
WC determined that a large village like Heytesbury would need 25 additional houses between 2016 and 2036; so a housing requirement over 15 years, which averaged at 1.3 homes being built each year, much through infill and over time. The net figure is in fact 22, and may be lower still now, due to recent, underway or planned building.
1. There is nothing that states build 25 houses in a new estate in one go. There is no reference in this document to affordable or social housing.
 2. The presumptions in that document were that the housing should not be outside the existing development boundaries;

3. Has to have the support of local community evidenced through consultation
Must reflect a proven need;
4. Environmental and landscape considerations will not be compromised;
5. Any building must reflect the character and setting of the existing village.
6. Zero building on flood zones 2 and 3;
7. Zero building in a green belt or outside the village development boundary;
8. Limited building in an Area of Outstanding Natural beauty (the Cranbourne Chase AONB boundary is at the River Wylfe);
9. Zero building in Habitat sites (SAC, SOPA) which the land bordering the River Wylfe has been classed as being,
10. Zero building in Areas of Specific Scientific Interest (SSSI) which the chalk stream River Wylfe is classed as being.

You are clearly aware of those facts and statistics. Therefore you have ignored them in deciding to proceed with the work carried out under the disguise of this proposal. As Chair of the Parish Council I would expect you to have shared this data with the existing PC members and also any "experts" co-opted onto the working group. It is clear you have not done this based on comments received from the "Experts" and also comments from some other PC members being unaware of these facts and considerations.

5. **Results of the Housing Needs Survey - Summer 2022**

1. Q3 - only 14% are in potential housing need
2. Q4 - 57% said 25 houses was ok or reasonable (over a 15 year period until 2036)
3. **Q5 - 54% did NOT support PC discussions with local landowners**
4. **Q6 - 58% did NOT want additional planning gain, like community/recreational space, Village Hall Q7 - 66% said NO to building outside the village development boundary**
5. **Q8 - only 3% were yes to setting up a Community Land Trust**
6. **Q9 - 72% felt the current amenities were adequate for the Parish.**

I see no majority or overwhelming majority in any of the numbers in these surveys. So where is your remit to do what you are proposing?

6. **Protection of the Cricket and Playing Fields**

You are using the guise of the above development to protect the fields north of Park Street, it is clearly a cover to get housing built that you personally have always pushed, as well as a cover for trying to get a village hall built. Despite the facts as noted above not having over whelming support from the village. In summary, it is clear these plans have not been thought through and are a smoke screen of deceit to drive home personal projects without overwhelming support from the village. I hope you and the PC read this response, even though most of the PC has not read responses to your own official surveys.

30. Please record this as my response and attach to the Corporate Record of the parish.

I see from the Wiltshire Times that today is the last day for you receiving comments. Bearing in mind the last drop in was 10 working days ago, this is not very long, if you truly want to receive feedback. Particularly when I hear there is a further drop in at St John's yet to be held. True consultation should not run to such a short deadline, as you well know. So to avoid missing your self imposed deadline, here is my feedback. I attach a document that analyses the statistical data that the PC has in front of it, but you and two other long standing councillors have chosen to ignore and disregard, presumably because the responses do not suit the personal agendas being pushed by a few. The data from the 2019 Housing Needs Survey does not support the need to build; 2.4% of the Parish might be in housing need. The WC Empowering Local Communities Plan in 2021 stated so many constraints against building, all of which apply to the land south of Park Street. I was concerned to pick up at the

drop in sessions that your "experts" were not aware of the data, including previous surveys the PC have commissioned, in particular that 66% of responses did not want to build outside the village development boundary; 54% did not want the PC to negotiate with landowners. There is clearly not an overwhelming majority of the electorate that support the PC leading on the building of houses, affordable or otherwise. I expect the attached statistical data to be included with this email as my full response and look forward to the matter being an Agenda item and properly discussed and scrutinised at a future PC meeting.

Parish Housing Needs Survey - June 2019. Commissioned by the PC, carried out by Wiltshire Council. These are some of the stats in the document, which do not support the need for affordable housing in the Parish. Based on 450 households and a response rate of 129 replies so 33.2% response rate:- * 11 households (out of 450) were in "housing need" based on average Wiltshire earnings of £28,329pa. This is 2.4% of the Parish * 2 households were on the Wiltshire Council Housing Register. This is 0.4% of the Parish. * In the 2011 Census there were 57 social houses in the parish, which is 16.3% of total housing. Wiltshire affordable housing average is 14.7%, so the Parish has more than the WCC average. * In addition the Parish has affordable rents at St John's Almshouses and the long term rents for tenants from the Heytesbury Estate would be classed as being more affordable than open market rates. * It states that there is a low level of turnover of social housing in the Parish. But that is the same in the private rental and private housing market; not much comes on to any of these markets due to Heytesbury being a sought after village. Wiltshire Council Local Plan - "Empowering Local Communities" - January 2021 This is the document where WC determined that a large village like Heytesbury would need 25 additional houses between 2016 and 2036; so a housing requirement over 15 years, which averaged at 1.3 homes being built each year, much through infill and over time. The net figure is in fact 22, and may be lower still now, due to recent, underway or planned building. There is nothing in that document that says build 25 houses in a new estate in one go. There is no reference at all to affordable or social housing. The presumptions in that document were that the housing should not be outside the existing development boundaries; has to have the support of local community evidenced through consultation, and must reflect a proven need; environmental and landscape considerations will not be compromised; any building must reflect the character and setting of the existing village. It also states the constraints of Zero building on flood zones 2 and 3; Zero building in a green belt or outside the village development boundary; limited building in an Area of Outstanding Natural beauty (the Cranbourne Chase AONB boundary is at the River Wylye); Zero building in Habitat sites (SAC, SOPA) which the land bordering the River Wylye has been classed as being, and Zero building in Areas of Specific Scientific Interest (SSSI) which the chalk stream River Wylye is classed as being. This is just stats that I have pulled from the document, and shared with the PC in discussions when I was a Councillor, and at meetings since, as a member of the Public. There is more data in the document, which is on the WC and PC website. Results of the Housing Needs Survey - Summer 2022 Q3 - only 14% are in potential housing need Q4 - 57% said 25 houses was ok or reasonable (over a 15 year period until 2036) Q5 - 54% did NOT support PC discussions with local landowners Q6 - 58% did NOT want additional planning gain, like community/recreational space, Village Hall Q7 - 66% said NO to building outside the village development boundary Q8 - only 3% were yes to setting up a Community Land Trust Q9 - 72% felt the current amenities were adequate for the Parish. This statistical analysis does not give an majority mandate nor an overwhelming or strong mandate to move forward with any of this; not more leaflet drops or drop-in events. Building houses, social or otherwise, is not something the PC has the remit or the responsibility to even do. And the results of this survey indicate it is not what the Parish want their PC to be doing on their behalf. Surely in a democratic society the views and opinions of the majority of households should be respected and the actions of the PC should be reflective of what the electorate has told the PC they want them to do on their behalf.

- 31.** I thought I'd better give you some feedback as all the comments forms I saw at the drop in were blank, how you can describe the drop ins as " positive, successful experience " is beyond me.

That was certainly not my feelings. It was quite obvious to me that you have hatched up some sort of plan for housing and a village hall with your fellow FPWG members and your Community Land Trust " advisors " !!, totally ignoring the results of the recent housing questionnaire. You must be well aware that there is considerable opposition in this village.

32. Thank you for the drop in meeting at the Red Lion to discuss new plans for new housing in Heytesbury. I was sad to speak to all your representatives who without exception were dogmatic in their desire to build houses in green fields at either end of the village.

I strongly oppose building outside of the settlement area and am of a widely shared opinion that once a precedent is established (to build houses), more of the same will follow. Look at Warminster, Westbury, Salisbury and the Weald in Sussex.

33. Those making decisions seem to ignore the environmental impact which is extraordinary in these times of climate change.

We must 1st measure the impact of the 900+ homes (west of Warminster) to the floodplain that runs down the Wylie Valley towards Salisbury. Winter 2022-2023 flooding occurred in Warminster as a direct result of new houses (Bishopstrow roundabout). Ruining the lives of existing property owners. When you also talk about housing need. It is important for the PC to understand the difference between Need and Demand. There will always be a need for residents to upsize, downsize, but actual demand is quite different. We are blessed with St John's for social housing for villagers in need, normally of retirement age and with minimal savings. That is what we need to focus on preserving for those in need, and future generations of connected locals people, especially as we all hope to live little longer. NOT building new houses that those genuinely in need can ill afford.

Perhaps think also of taking on The Angel as a community project, Village Hall and meeting place. That I would happily support.