

**Wiltshire Council**

**Full Council**

**18 July 2023**

---

**Item 10 – Wiltshire Local Plan Review**

**From Celia Beckett, Chair of the Hilperton Area Action Group (HAAG)**

**To Cllr Nick Botterill – Cabinet Member for Finance, Development Management and Strategic Planning**

Preamble

At the Cabinet meeting on the 11th July there was a suggestion of a further period of consultation for the sites selected prior to going to the Regulation 19 consultation to enable local involvement i.e. a further period of Regulation 18 consultation. We wish to raise this issue in relation to the North Trowbridge site. The site differs from the original site plan. It now includes a large field, the majority of site 677a on the western edge; this field was not in either the first site selection nor is it recommended in the current planning for Trowbridge document. It is where the primary school is sited on the plan and more housing to the north. This field also adjoins the Hilperton settlement.

**Question (P23-19)**

Please can you explain how this site can be taken forward if there has been no Regulation 18 consultation on the inclusion of this field and it's inclusion is not recommended by the strategic planners as "the site has exposed views from the north which would be difficult to mitigate and would be seen as a prominent urban encroachment into the countryside."

**Response:**

The 2021 Regulation 18 consultation sought stakeholder views on the future strategy for the Local Plan review and included options for strategic growth. That consultation was not intended to consult stakeholders on every aspect of the Plan as it was known that the Plan would evolve and be refined as evidence emerged. The consultation responses provided the council with a good understanding of the issues that needed to be taken into consideration.

Site 677a, while not forming part of the preferred site that was consulted on in 2021, does now form part of the proposed allocation at North Trowbridge (substantially reduced in size from the preferred site). It is correct that the site does have exposed

views, but this part of the assessment is quoted in isolation. The site would not have exposed views when considered as part of the larger site to the east. It should also be noted that only the eastern parcel of site 677a is included as part of Site 5.

There are drafting errors in the document, which will be corrected.