



Marlborough

Area Neighbourhood Plan

MANP Steering Group 27.5.21 at 1.30pm via 'zoom'.

MINUTES

Attend: Cllr Mervyn Hall (MTCO), Susanne Harris, Cllr Noel Barret-Morton (MTC), Neil Homer (Consultant), Stuart Dobson, Deirdre Watson (Mildenhall Parish), Deborah Scofield, Cllr Guy Singleton (Savernake PC), Bill Ro (Marlborough College), Richard Spencer-Williams (MTC Town Clerk)

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'Neill Homer – **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 29. 4. 21, and matters arising** Agreed
2. **Chair announcements** – some training workshops are being arranged by Marlborough town Council to ensure all Councillors, especially new ones, are familiar with the MANP and the NP process; in preparedness for the MANP to be considered in July. They have been also offered to all Councils involved and will run on the 30th June, prior to July Council meetings. Cllr Noel Barret Morton is now MTC representative. Cllr Caroline Thomas is the nominated WC representative (to be confirmed by WC). Stuart Dobson was invited to remain on the SG as member of public due to his long involvement in the MANP process.
3. **Feedback on the meeting with Woods Plc (Agents Crown Estate)**
CMH, SD and RSW Met on the 18.5.21 with Woods Plc. Changes to Elcot 1 and the Salisbury Road site will need more detailed work. Woods Plc stated they were disappointed and felt they could do a sympathetic development at Elcot 1. Also, that they may advise their client to object to the examiner. The Crowns Estates view is yet to be known.

NH clarified – the objection could be made, but the examiner cannot re-instate the site. They can recommend a deletion, but not this is not binding. WC could choose to delete a site also. The examiner can only comment on what is in the plan. The total number of the homes

the MANP allows for exceeds the number WC stated as a target so this should go in the MANP favour. It is legitimate for a NP SG to consider community feedback when forming a NP.

4. To receive and approve the draft plan for submission (subject to final resolution of outstanding matters)

The following points were discussed and noted;

- Land interests- WC has offered a site plan only at this stage. The Crown Estate responses re: Salisbury Rd were to be received, but the agents are aware of the need for this.
- ACOM – have to make changes to SEA report to reflect policy changes, and this is in working progress.
- Design reports need amending – Townscape study for Marlborough needs to reflect WC feedback (SH to check)
- Reg 14 Townscape supplement reports for Manton and Minal, picking up specific design issues (to be completed by NH)
- Outstanding the Habitat Regulations Assessment needs to be completed with Thames Water. RSW and WC Morgan Jones has followed up, but Thames Water have yet to reply.
- Other evidence base reports are in place.
- Basic conditions statement (NH to complete).

The SG then discussed Draft Plan for agreement. Points discussed were;

SD – Re: 5.37 raised the question if this was not relevant as WC dropped the ASQ in the Local Plan. Core Policy 57 now covers the air quality issue. (NH to clarify).

GS – the plan needs to ensure the list of unlisted Buildings in Savernake Parish needs added in appendices. NH confirmed this should be added.

Action: NH to do final edit based on DW proof reading/ feedback.

How the plan should be written to balance technical detail with resident accessibility. NH reinforce the need to ensure enough technical detail is included to ensure it has sufficient basis in 'planning' terms.

Agreed: Final approval of plan (v6) can now happen on the 24th June meeting

5. Consultation Statement for submission

RSW has done most of this but need assistance in ;

1. Checking the 'consultee list'
2. Writing a synopsis of the amendments to the plan as a result of Regulation 14 feedback
3. Checking the timeline
4. General accuracy of events – and that noting significant has been missed.

Action: RSW to circulate for feedback and amendments

5. Also, an overview report of the Regulation 14 feedback comments need to be created so that the 'consultation trail' is complete'.

Action: RSW to create a word document collating the feedback comments which can form part of the appendices.

6. Clarification of submission documents

NH advised Appendix B 'Schedule of Evidence' in NP (p58) is in the main complete, but there may need to be some slight updating.

7. To note the relevant Marlborough Town Council and Parish meetings for approving for submission of the MANP

MTC - 19th July

Savernake – 12th July

Minal- 12th July

DW to report to Minal on behalf of MANP SG. GS to make Savernake PC aware. RSW to email Mildenhall PC to request the need to do this.

8. Finance

Current budget is committed, but a 5k Grant and Technical Grant to Locality has been applied for by RSW. Locality have confirmed both should be ok and will take a couple of weeks to be confirmed. The grants will cover professional support to complete the MANP.

9. Communications

The SG discussed the need for ensuring the MANP is communicated properly. NH advised the MANP can be 'advertised', but 'Councils' can not use public funds to sway public opinion. However, the plan will need to be promoted and advertised at the right time, to ensure residents can vote in the referendum.

DW suggested an update on the status of process should be communicated at the right juncture i.e., the draft plan has been forward to WC and to explain Reg 15/16.

Action: RSW to contact WC to advise MANP SG are aiming for a July submission, and would hope to have referendum before Christmas. Also, to clarify guidelines around acceptable publicity.

It was discussed what FAQs could be published to communicate to residents, and the need to not compromise the NP process in doing this i.e., not publish what essentially should appear in the final plan when published by WC.

Action: WR volunteered to look at FAQs, to be discussed at the next SG.

NH advised they only needs to include;

- What did people say at Reg 14 stage re; key comments
 - What have we done about it? e.g. Elcot, Sports Policy, deletion of George Lane Policy
- NH advised the SG could do a press release to explain the changes, and next steps in the process.

The SG discussed the risk of the MANP not being supported by the Councils; and where this would leave the process.

10. Next meeting dates.

24.6.21 1.30pm