



Marlborough

Area Neighbourhood Plan

MANP Steering Group 29.4.21 at 1.30pm via 'zoom'.

Minutes

Present: Cllr Mervyn Hall (MTC), Cllr Stewart Dobson (WC), Susanne Harris, Bill Roe (Marlborough College), Deborah Scofield (TM), Cllr Noel Barret – Morton, Deirdre Watson, Richard Spencer-Williams (Town Clerk), Neil Homer (Consultant), Cllr Peter Cairns, Guy Singleton.

Apologies: Sir Nigel Thompson (SNT)

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

Peter Cairns announced his resignation with this Steering Group Meeting being his last one. Mervyn Hall and the Steering Group thanked Peter for his hard work and contribution to the MANP.

1. To agree minutes of 8. 4. 21

Agreed.

2. To review the outcome of the 'technical meeting' with Wiltshire Council, and consider any amendments to the MANP.

NH – feedback an overview of the outcomes from the meeting as follows;

- Overall, there are not too many issues in need of work / resolution related to the points made by WC.
- The meeting with WC focussed on;
 1. The Habitat regulations process
 2. Climate change policies, and the PassivHaus Policy to be recommended for inclusion under Policy MARL20, with some 'tidying up' on the Green infrastructure plan.
 3. Barton Park – asking WC to clarify their objection.
 4. Town Centre , and how the WC Local Plan will need to take account of this.
 5. Medical facilities /sites.
 6. A possible 'Option 6' for housing allocations, that removed sites 1.1 and 1.2, and the housing evidence base.
 7. That WC are yet to complete the review of their Local Plan and comments received, and the impact of their final plan's timescale which may be amended, on the MANP process.
 8. Other various technical matters.

3. Update on the feedback from landowners as requested re: MARL1 and consider amendments to the MANP, and final agreement re: Housing targets.

Feedback from Crown Estates, Marlborough College, Walsingham Planning (North Down) has been received, with acknowledgement from WC but comments yet to be received.

- I. The SG debated the merits of the Housing Targets
 - **MH** stated that in his view the affordable housing targets can be substantiated, and technical problems related to the sites can be mitigated. That the housing targets are really one of public opinion and would ensure Crown support for the MANP, and that he is still in support of the housing target as stated.
 - **NH**- outlined the '**Option6**' as an alternative housing target, which removes the Salisbury Rd & Elcot Lane sites (MARL 1.1 and 1.2). The technical objections to both sites are similar, hence his proposal to remove both, rather than just 1.1, to which the majority of public objections have been made., . This would mean the need to reassess the core vision of the MANP due to the loss of the provision of affordable houses from the two sites; the environmental effect would be minimised, but social benefit would be reduced.
- II. The merits of this proposal were then considered;
 - **DW** – asked why both sites need to be excluded, rather than just site 1.1 (Elcot Lane)?
 - **NH** – clarified that his judgment is based on the fact there is no significant material difference in the technical objections to both sites.
 - **DW** – stated she was not convinced the evidence base is robust enough to justify the additional housing proposed, given the level of public objection.
 - **MH**- stated 50% affordable housing can be delivered via covenants between land owner and developer, and the allocation comes from WC policy. The high proportion of the affordable home would be purchased by Housing Associations.
 - **NB-M**- stated housing targets should remain.

- **SD-** stated he supports DW comments, and the Elcot Lane site should be deleted.

III. There was a debate about the housing target in MANP, and in particular whether site 1.1 (Elcot Lane) should be removed given public opinion expressed in the consultation exercise.

SH – has concerns about Elcot Lane. The site could lead to a lot of congestion, and high volume of traffic – which may lead to road safety issues.

GS – Elcot Lane considered the access was not ideal.

NH – advised the Elcot Lane site will assume a lower density and not create same on street parking demand, and that the SG can modify the Policy to include the land to the East to take account for a ‘buffer’ based on environmental value/ landscape.

PC – highlighted the problem is to reconcile the public view of the Elcot Lane site with Social benefit. He suggested need to include in the plan the public view, and Elcot Lane may just be taking the plan a bit too far.

BR- stated that the affordable housing is needed and evidenced satisfactorily, so there is a need to come up with a way of accommodating this need. In balance the SG may need to accept the limits of the options available to achieve a plan with all things considered, and suggested the referendum was there to decide on what can best be presented. Following the removal of Preshute from the Plan, finding acceptable sites was made more difficult, and it may be that the SG need to explain that the initial aspirations could not be achieved.

NH – advised the MANP can have as many sites as the SG want, and that Option 6 is an option based on technical reasons, but a plan can also offer sites based on referendum/ community support.

GS – questioned if the Crown could be asked to offer part of Elcot site for sport facilities – which would prevent over development, but counter their development aspiration? **MH** clarified this was currently part of a farm. But not straight forward to achieve.

SH – suggested other brown field (TH White, Elm Tree Motors, Tile Factory) sites may become available in coming years which could be better used for housing development, rather than the currently proposed green field sites. **MH** said that these are not firm options at the moment.

NH – advised that brown field sites are currently secured by developers.

SD – suggested the TH White site could be feasible if it became available. Elcot Lane 2 would also have access issues to A4, and that the SG should take notice of public opinion on Elcot Lane 1.

BR – stated the question is not the need but where to accommodate it? the sites available are not sufficient to enable easy placement. The reconciliation of all the need, demands, and options is not in its entirety achievable. Also, the SG may have to settle for the ‘best’ attempt in balance.

PC – suggested that in e short-term, in order to gain support for the Plan in the referendum, it needs revision based on public opinion, but the long-term aim for more affordable housing could remain as a MANP aspirational target.

The SG then held a vote on whether the Elcot Lane site should be removed from the Plan this matter:

Vote :Keep Housing same – x1

Delete Elcot Lane 1 – x7

Abstentions – x1

Agreed – Option 7

4. Decision re: Sports facilities / Marl 9 , and if to include it as a separate policy.

NH – can include a generic statement in MARL 9 or add new policy.

Agreed to add separate policy.

5. To consider and decide additional advisories actions from ONeil Homer consultancy;

- **MARL1/2** – to consider deleting reference to existing health facility. ref to delete MARL 2

Discussed how best to present this need in the plan.

NH – recommended to delete Policy 2. Policy 1 provides reference to a new health facility(within Barton Deane).

Agreed Policy 2 to be deleted, Policy 1.3 wording ref health facility to be amended.

- **MARL4** – SG to consider if Cobweb should also be asked to evidence existing supply and demand for older persons accommodation

Agreed This can be done locally via the SG.

Action : to find out the number of the over 55's developments in 'recent' times (circa. 5-10yrs) (SD).

- **MARL6** – SG to consider deleting the policy in the light of new Government Planning guidelines regarding employment land
NH – advised Policy 6 will not work with Government planning changes re: employment land class definition.
DW suggested some narrative to ensure recognition of employment land need' given public comments (NH to offer recommended wording)

Agreed – to delete Policy 6

6. To confirm at the last meeting the following were agreed and therefore do not need to be revisited:

- **MARL3** – Mildenhall policy to stay the same
- **MARL7** – modify policy to incorporate various comments inc. Savernake PC
- **MARL15/21** – delete MARL21 and merge elements into MARL15
- **MARL16** – retain Barton Park as a Local Green Space
- **MARL20** – modify in line with policies of further advanced NPs (to be discussed with WC)

Agreed as stated above

7. Any other specific amendments.

SD – Policy 1 need to firm up air quality aspect.

NH – to look at re-wording next draft of plan. The next draft to be circulated to the SG with a view to finalising at the next meeting. NH to send the next draft to SH for review of the “green” related policies, and to DW for overall review/proof reading at least one week before the next meeting.

8. Next meeting dates.

SG – 27.5.21 1.30pm

Also, a meeting with the Crown Estates to communicate the removal of site 1.1 tba – MH, SD (RSW)