

Hungerford Town Council responds to the DPD as follows:

- 1) The Council has come forward with this response on the basis of the following strategic aims:
 - To minimise the development of green land beyond the town boundary;
 - To minimise the impact on the AONB landscape;
 - To provide housing for the town in line with local housing need and the Town Plan Refresh;
 - That the level of development is proportionate to the size, the function of, and the facilities within the town, in line with the wishes of the people of the town as expressed in the Town Plan Refresh;
 - To minimise the addition of traffic on the High Street which is a Conservation Area.
- 2) The Council welcomes the proposed number of new houses of between 87 and 101 for the town. This is considered to be proportionate to the existing size of the town and is in line with the Hungerford Town Plan Refresh. It is also considered to be consistent with the recent Hungerford housing needs survey.
- 3) Of the two main options presented to the town, the Council prefers the Eddington Sites (HUN 005, HUN006, HUN 015 and HUN 020) Option over the site to the east of Salisbury Road (HUN007), ***but, with significant modifications.***
- 4) To achieve the equivalent number of houses the Council request that the allocation should include the sites identified on Table 1 below. The Table shows the sites, a housing density assumed by WBC and the potential resultant unit numbers.
- 5) The Council would support the development of the same sites as proposed under the Eddington sites option (HUN03 - Hungerford Vets, HUN015 - Land at Bath Road, HUN020 - Hungerford Garden Centre) but has severe reservations about the amount of land to be developed at HUN005 - Folly Dog Leg Field. This has also been identified for development as part of the option, but the Town Council believes the development of a smaller parcel of the site of around 0.65 hectares is more appropriate. This would mean that the proposed amended boundary would extend to a line no further north than the current rear boundary of the Garden Centre, and eastwards to the landscape buffer (belt of trees running northwards from the A4) a short distance beyond the current eastern settlement boundary along the A4. Significantly this does not extend the resultant settlement boundary further northwards up the slope, as it is considered it would have an unacceptable impact on the AONB landscape.

Table 1: Recommended Sites for Allocation

	Potential dwellings	Density per WBC (1)
HUN01 Smitham Bridge Road	26	20
HUN03 Hungerford vets	5	20
HUN015 Land at Bath Road	7	20
HUN020 Hungerford Garden Centre	17	20
HUN023 Oakes site at station (excluding St John Ambulance)	11	60
HUN005 Folly Dog (3)	20	
TOTAL	86	

Notes:

(1) Uses WBC density assumptions except HUN005 Folly Dog

(2) Anticipate that density will be greater and yields higher than shown above

(3) HUN005 assumes only 0.65 hectares should be developed, due to infrastructural and landscape impact constraints

- 6) The Town Council is of the opinion that the key advantages of the development of these sites over the site east of Salisbury Road can be summarised as:
- The sites to the north of the Bath Road (A4) consists of about 70% previously developed land and will have a significantly less resultant visual impact on the landscape of the AONB;
 - Given the current and predicted traffic flows, there will be less of a traffic impact on the main route through the town centre which is a Conservation Area where there are sensitive environmental receptors associated with additional traffic.
- 7) HUN01 at Smitham Bridge Road is identified as a site that has been considered for allocation. The reasons for rejection as stated by WBC in the Table on page 33 of the Draft DPD Preferred Options Document are not accepted by the Town Council as the site does not suffer from flooding and housing would function well next to the Hungerford Trading Estate, which already has housing adjacent to it to the east. HUN001 is considered to be well shielded from views across the AONB and a landscape study carried out for the AONB by Land Management Services Ltd (LMS) in 2011, identified the site as the only green field site beyond the settlement boundary which could be an ***‘appropriate site for development’***.
- 8) HUN023, the Oakes site at the rail station should also be considered as this would be expected to provide some additional dwellings in the town and again is on previously developed land. It is quite likely that more housing than the 11 at Oakes and 6 at St John sites will come forward as the site becomes redeveloped in line with the rail station area Development Brief.

- 9) In regard to HUN021, The Lamb, Charnham Street, there is concern about the proposed amendment to the settlement boundary at this location due to the sensitivity to change of the environment, which is adjacent to the river. The views of the Town & Manor and AONB Board should be taken into account in this matter.

Please accept these comments as the formal response to the preferred options document on behalf of Hungerford Town Council.