

HILPERTON PARISH COUNCIL

COMMUNITY GOVERNANCE REVIEW

Scheme 18: The Parish Council supports this scheme and is happy to respond to the comments submitted by Trowbridge Town Council by agreeing to the following 'tidying amendments'. Firstly, the boundary to the green hatched area in the south-east of the scheme being moved south east from the stream to follow the fence line of the houses in Moyle Park. REASON: To allow the whole of the open area of grassland to be under the control of the same first tier authority, allowing easier maintenance of the whole area when the Parish Council assumes responsibility for it. Secondly, the boundary to the green hatched area in the north west of the scheme being moved north-west from the cycle/footpath to follow the fence line of the housing development. Reason: As above. The Parish Council can see no improvement to governance by moving any of these houses into Trowbridge and again asks the CGR working group (CGRwg) to assist local democracy by leaving the houses and open spaces in Hilperton parish. It would again remind the CGRwg that this area contains the main shopping area for houses in the parish, the well-used Red Admiral public house and the Paxcroft Mead Community Centre (of which the Parish Council is the custodian trustee and appoints a member to the governing committee of the centre). It also contains one of the two primary schools in the parish and the most recently constructed affordable housing development. The town council is happy for 'fence lines' to be regarded as 'natural boundaries' in other schemes it has promoted and so, presumably, would be consistent in its approach to this scheme too.

Scheme 19: The Parish Council supports this scheme suggested by the CGRwg which would assist the aim of better local governance for the residents by combining them with their near neighbours who are already in Hilperton Parish.

Scheme 20: The Parish Council objects to this scheme as it would not assist the stated aims of the CGR.

Scheme 22: The Parish Council objects to this scheme in its entirety, as it cannot see how it would achieve the required aims of the CGR. If the CGRwg sees any merit in the scheme, the Parish Council would suggest that the new Leapgate road would form a far more logical eastern boundary to Trowbridge rather than the Town Council proposed, which runs all the way east to Ashton Road.

Scheme 23: The Parish Council can see the logic of this proposal which came from the CGRwg. However, it would hope that the working group will not insist that the housing north-west of Leapgate all has to be in the same parish. As there are far more houses in this area than in the existing 'Hilperon housing' (see scheme 18), a flawed result to the consultation could be reached if the Town Council has been lobbying the houses within its boundary, as the numbers are heavily skewed in its favour.

Scheme 25: The Parish Council objects to this scheme as it would not assist the stated aims of the CGR, not least due to the fact that the land still (as when the Planning Inspector made his report) consists of open fields which are not allocated for housing in the 2026 Core Strategy. The Parish Council would draw the attention of the CGRwg to the comments of the West Wiltshire District Council Local Plan (1st alteration) Inspector when he commented as follows (Parish Council emphasis). Please note that, as expected by the Inspector in 2.2.48, there were no substantial earthworks required to construct the Hilperon Relief Road. For your information, the Inspector abolished 'Rural Buffer' areas, as his opinion was that they were not needed where settlements had their own development boundaries.

Trowbridge

2.2.46: The western border of the proposed rural buffer here is drawn tight against the backs of properties mostly in Wyke Road, Victoria Road and Albert Road ... (to which there is no objection).

2.2.47: This area so contained comprises a series of small fields, separated by hedges, and crossed by a number of public and other footpaths. From my visits to this locality, I consider that at present this area appears as a reasonably homogenous tract of open land, although there are subtle differences in landscape character within it. It is partly in agricultural use and partly consists of unused grassland, but there are views of Hilperton and the edge of Trowbridge from within and across it. **I consider that the properties in Wyke Road, Victoria Road and Albert Road form an obvious definition to the eastern edge of Trowbridge** hereabouts and that there is currently no obvious alternative feature within the land forming the proposed rural buffer which would better mark the edge of the town.

2.2.48: I appreciate that the proposed Hilperton Relief Road is intended to cross this land broadly from north-west to south-east. Although the precise alignment of the road is not formally before me, a draft scheme has been drawn up and was presented to the Inquiry. From this and my own observations, I cannot imagine that substantial earthworks would be needed to accommodate the road, wherever its precise route lay, so that its impact in the landscape might not be great. **In these circumstances I do not believe that it would, if built here, appear as a more convincing boundary to the town than the existing development.** (*My conclusions and recommendations on Policy T5A will be relevant to this matter*). I therefore believe that the town policy limit hereabouts should be drawn along what would have been the western edge of the rural buffer.

2.2.49: An alternative boundary to the town policy limit further to the east would enable the development to take place on the land so enclosed. This would extend Trowbridge into open land having a reasonably pleasant appearance and would in my opinion harm the semi-rural character and appearance of the area as open fields were replaced by built development of one form or another. It would also erode the gap between Trowbridge and Hilperton. There is no remaining objection seeing the allocation of all or any part of this land for housing, and no need for it to be so allocated in order to meet WSP housing land requirements.

Scheme 103: The Parish Council proposed this scheme as it would use a natural feature (the existing roads) and thus tie-in with the Town Council idea of using roads in various schemes which the Town Council has suggested. The Parish Council is aware that many residents whose houses back onto the Hilperton Gap use it as an ad hoc recreation space and also worship at the local Hilperton Church and avail themselves of the facilities at Hilperton Village Hall and the adjacent playing field.

