



Marlborough

Area Neighbourhood Plan

MANP Steering Group 10.2.22 at 1.30pm via 'zoom'.

Minutes

Attend: Cllr Mervyn Hall (MTC), Susanne Harris, , Cllr Guy Singleton (Savernake PC), Deirdre Watson, Nigel Thompson, Cllr Caroline Thomas, Richard Spencer-Williams (MTC Town Clerk)

Apologies: Deborah Scofield, Stuart Dobson

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 27.1.22, and matters arising

Agreed

2. Response to Examiners Opening Enquiries

- Response form KAMP to reiterate their view they need more space, and that the CCG provide the response to the Plan at reg 16 stage.
- WC – has acknowledged there are no brown field sites for Marlborough.
- Cobweb- reiterated the assessment is about need only.
- MH/ RSW Meeting with Marlborough College on the 21.2.22, also with their agents to clarify their position.
- Have an examiner extension until 28.2.22.
- NH (with some assistance from MH/RSW) has started work on response document.

Discussed the approach crafted by OH and if the SG are happy to take an assertive approach in the response to the examiner.

Agreed to support such an approach, whilst retaining 'editor' rights. SG to ask OH to proceed but with a diplomatic, empathetic, and respectful style.

The Steering Group discussed the draft Response document and made amendments to clarify the responses.

Other points discussed were;

- Options for parking that could be considered in the future.
- SH suggested more work on the maps. The main map shows three 'inset' maps which could be labelled more clearly, with numbers added to the map.
- The merits of continuing to request a meeting with the Examiner, particularly to ensure clear shared understandings on the issues raised by the Examiner.

Agreed to request a meeting with th Examiner (RSW to liaise with NH for advice on approach)

ACTION

- SH / RW meet to revisit and improve main map / labelling
- DW to send feedback comments on the first draft response to RSW
- Refer point 24 to NH

3. Finance

A Locality grant application to assist with consultant fees for £1300 has been submitted. There will be a shortfall which MTC will fund; it was felt these funds are needed for the professional support required to ensure a response to the Examiner.

4. Communications

No specific communications at this stage

5. Next meeting date – 21.2.22 at 1.30pm via 'zoom'