

## **Notes of the CGR Public Consultation, Council Chamber, County Hall, 11 May 2016**

---

### Present

Cllr Stuart Wheeler (Chairman of the CGR Working Group), Cllr Glenis Ansell (CGR Working Group), Cllr Ernie Clark (CGR Working Group and HPC), Cllr Ian McLennan (CGR Working Group)

### Also Present

32 Public and Parish Representatives

---

The Chairman opened the meeting and provided details of the CGR process and the criteria that needed to be taken into account by the working group in making their recommendations and Council in making any determinations.

It was noted that Cllr Clark would remove himself from the working group for consideration of all Hilperton proposals, and speak in his capacity as Chairman of HPC. Following the meeting he would not be present for any discussions of the working group when formulating a recommendation on those Hilperton proposals,

### **Scheme 21 - Shore Place**

None of those present expressed a view on the proposal.

### **Scheme 24 - Lady Down Farm**

Representatives of TTC - Land in green belt and protected by policy, HoltPC did not mention this area in green belt in original draft of their proposed neighbourhood plan. People in area use facilities in Trowbridge, Holt almost 3 miles away, all HPC and Staverton Cllrs closer than any Holt Cllrs.

No representatives from HoltPC were in attendance.

### **Scheme 26 - Area 4a Old Farm Estate, Scheme 27 - Area 4b, Scheme 28 - Area 4c, Area 4d, White Horse Business Park**

#### For

Old Farm is geographically isolated from the rest of the parish, being fully integrated into the built up area of the town, a situation which will intensify as areas 4b, 4c and 4d are built upon in the coming years, a relevant consideration for the working group to consider, and which forms a logical urban extension of the town. To maintain the rural nature of the parish, as it wishes, these areas should be transferred to the town, in addition to the facts on the ground supporting this and supporting improved cohesion of governance. Wider community area benefits from acknowledgement of present and soon to be realities of building and urban growth. Business park area never wanted by parish previously, and area to north of it assigned for significant housing.

#### Against

Old Farm estate is an integral part of the existing parish and identity and governance would not be improved by transferring it, the parish can become a bigger entity in its own right and will be more efficient than town. Housing in areas 4b, 4c and 4d not for many years, transferring land now would be premature. Transferring areas would be detrimental to parish

amenity and change character of area, as well as including industrial or commercial land with no criteria met for transferral. People of the area overwhelmingly against transferring, town just after financial gain not community improvement.

### **Scheme 24 - Lady Down Farm**

#### For

Is about tidying up anomalous boundary, canal is a natural boundary and only access for residents is through the town. Holt village may look to other settlements more than Trowbridge, but this area and properties are accessible only through town and its on the ground connection is to Trowbridge. Governance would be improved through recognising that, particular given separation from rest of Holt parish.

#### Against

Only a few properties affected, no governance improvements and those residents want to remain in parish, feel more connection with Bradford on Avon anyway. Separated from Trowbridge by railway and river so just as separated from Holt Village, and leaving boundary on field lines is normal practice. Parish able to provide efficient local government, neighbourhood plan does include this area, being subsumed within Trowbridge undermines identity of area.

### **Scheme 18 and Scheme 22 - HPC and TTC proposals for Paxcroft Mead**

#### For TTC/Against HPC

Almost separate from town and village, estate its own identity almost, so key is improving governance by making under one parish rather than two, and Hilperton road is a good natural boundary between them, simpler than current boundary. Line goes across streets, difficult to serve people best if area split between what will be a large town surrounded contiguously with several smaller towns. Road opening means there is direct connection to town even if Hilperton road not made the boundary.

#### For HPC/Against TTC

Area has feel of a village and would like to remain so. Might be its own parish one day, but until then best served remaining part of Hilperton, which is custodian of several assets in area. Suggested natural boundary of stream, but happy for all green areas to be under one parish, and include with the current parish holder, Hilperton. TTC argued scheme 24 people have to go through Trow so should be Trow, these places have to go through what is currently Hilperton.

### **Scheme 19 and Scheme 20 - Wyke Road**

#### For 19/Against 20

Governance improved by not splitting street between parishes, area used to be in Trowbridge and makes more sense given the gap to Hilperton village. County town identity should mean promoting its expansion, or recognising that which has already taken place as a part of it.

#### For 20/Against 19

Listen to what the people in the area want, just because close to town does not mean are a part of it.

### **Scheme 25 - Hilperton Gap**

For

Boundary better defined by road. May be developed in future despite wishes of all.

Against

No houses, not assigned for housing even if speculative applications come in, No community benefits, no governance improvement.

### **Scheme 103 – Wyke Road extended**

For

No specific comments were noted.

Against

Creates same problem 19a and 20 are trying to resolve, only magnified by 10 by splitting streets between parishes illogically for an even bigger area.

### **Scheme 23 - Hulbert Close**

For

No specific comments were noted.

Against

Suggested as estate should be in one parish – that is agreed, but this would in fact extend current problem and makes no sense given built up area.

---

### **General comments:**

There were general comments in favour of supporting town expansion to improve economic potential of town, and reflecting the reality of existing and planned town expansion with the boundaries.

There were general comments about the town boundary expanding being unnecessary and damaging to parish identity.

There were general comments to the effect that there was no need to make any changes to some or all of the proposed areas.