



Marlborough

Area Neighbourhood Plan

MANP Steering Group 27.1.22 at 1.30pm via 'zoom'.

Minutes

Attend: Cllr Mervyn Hall (MTC), Susanne Harris, , Cllr Guy Singleton (Savernake PC), , Deirdre Watson, Stuart Dobson, , Richard Spencer-Williams (MTC Town Clerk)

Apologies: Deborah Scofield, Nigel Thompson, Cllr Caroline Thomas

Glossary of Terms: **ARK** – Action for the River Kennet – **BCS** – Basis Condition Statement - **CCG** - Clinical Commissioning Group – **CLT** – Community Land Trust - **HNA** – Housing Needs Assessment – **KAMP** – Kennet & Avon Medical Partnership - **LP** – Local Plan – **LPA** – Local Planning Authority - **MHCLG** - Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government - **MTC** – Marlborough Town Council – **NA** - Neighbourhood Area – **NFU** – National Farmers Union - **NP** – Neighbourhood Plan – **NPPF** – National Planning Policy Framework **NPSG** – Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group – **OH** – O'NeillHomer - **PC** – Parish Council – **PPG** – Patient Participation Group – **SA** – Sustainability Appraisal and also Site Assessment - **SHELAA** – Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment - **SHMA** – Strategic Housing Market Assessment - **SEA** – Strategic Environmental Assessment - **ToR** – Terms of Reference - **TM** - Transition Marlborough – **WALPA** – Wiltshire Area local Planning Alliance - **WCS** – Wiltshire Core Strategy – **WC** – Wiltshire Council - **WP** – Working Party

1. To agree minutes of 25.11.21, and matters arising

AGREED: The minutes of 25.11.21 were agreed as a true record, with some minor grammatical amendments.

MH update dated the SG on a WC NP meeting held on the 25.1.21.

- *The Local Plan still to be finalised. The forecast adoption date for WC's Local Plan is now the end of 2023.*
- *WC looking to engage parishes to assist in a design code.*
- *The Filand's development at Malmesbury was flagged as an example where the inspector commented there was no policy excluding areas for development; but as this was a negative comment (which is disallowed in by NP guidance) has caused some precedential confusion in the NP process.*
- *Land supply in Wiltshire is currently 4.41 years, and the Government recently re-stated it is the responsibility for Local authorities to ensure this.*

- *WC have a significant resource issue to carry out the NP support work.*

2. Response to Examiners Opening Enquiries

MH and RSW met on the 25.1.22 with WC Planning Officer Michael Kilminster and Morgan Jones, to clarify the issues flagged up by the examiners opening enquires, and seek advice on how to progress the response. Also, to allow WC to explain their response. The examiner is keen to resolve any issues 'on paper' as robustly and fairly as possible.

The SG discussed issues that the examiner raised and the implications for the MANP.

It was agreed that many of them were either technical or relating to the evidence base and its referencing.

There were some concerns in the SG at how much more the consultant fee would be for the further work.

There was a general discussion about sustaining the NP process going forward.

AGREED: to commission OH Consultants to do the work needed to respond to the examiner.

ACTION RSW to request, via WC, an extension for the SG to respond to the Examiner, to allow the OH, and the SG to do the work needed. RSW to confirm with NH the instruction to do the work needed to respond to the examiner.

3. Feedback from meeting with Avon and Kennet Medical Partnership

MH, SH, RSW met KAMP representatives on th 20.1.22 to clarify their reasons for their response to the MANP, and the surprise the SG had as it did not fit with the conversation the g and KAMP had previously had. It was apparent the KAMP had essentially been supplied by the CCG on their behalf and that this 'strategic ' picture had influenced the local response and view. The meeting was useful to re-educate the KAMP about the NP process and the MANP, as there are new partners involved from those initially consulted. The new KAMP partners expressed view was the opportunity presented by the MANP for a new medical facility was actually potentially positive. The SG agreed to seek comment form the KAMP to this effect.

ACTION RSW to send note of meeting to KAMP and request some feedback comment from them as a result of the meeting.

4. Finance

No budget at present. A Locality grant is about to be submitted by RSW, to help with more consultant fees needed to support he MANP SG response to the examiner enquires. There is potential for £1100 left in the MANP allowance. If further funds are needed MH and RW would request MTC to support.

5. Communications

No specific communications as present.

6. Next meeting date – 10th or 17th February at 1.30pm to review OH response to examiner/ situation