



Marlborough Area Neighbourhood Plan

**Virtual Steering Group Meeting
Thursday, 23 July 2020 at 1.30pm
Via Zoom**

Present: Cllr Mervyn Hall (Chair), [MH], Noel Barrett-Morton [NBM], Cllr Peter Cairns [PC], Susanne Harris [SH], Neil Homer (OH) [NH], Shelley Parker (Town Clerk) [SP], Bill Roe (Marlborough College) [BR], Deborah Schofield (Transition Marlborough) [DS], Guy Singleton (Savernake Parish Council) [GS] and Deirdre Watson [DW]

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 – **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 - **WCS** – Wiltshire Core Strategy – **WC** – Wiltshire Council - **WP** – Working Party

NOTES

1. Welcome/Apologies/Clearance of Minutes/Update

MH welcomed all to the meeting. There were apologies from Cllr Stewart Dobson, Morgan Jones and Sir Nigel Thompson. The minutes of the meeting of 16 July 2020 was agreed as a correct record.

Update – MH and PC had attended a virtual meeting with landowners, Marlborough College, (23 July) where it had been confirmed that the College was happy to continue with development proposals for the site with reduced housing numbers and within the Marlborough town boundary and that the offer of land for a medical centre remained in place.

2. Re-designation of Neighbourhood Area

MH confirmed that this had been discussed during a meeting with WC that morning where Morgan Jones and WC's Neighbourhood Planning Manager, Mike Kilmister, had confirmed the legislative framework for considering area designation applications is the same for new or amended areas and the new area designation will need to be in place before the Regulation 14 process can start. The process is on the WC website at:

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/neighbourhood-planning--2#designating-a-neighbourhood-area>

All 3 parishes councils will need to agree the re-designation via a resolution and minute.

OH was also seeking advice on the process via the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG)

ACTION: [SP] to draw up application for re-designation and seek guarantees on timescales around consultation and sign off from WC. [SP] to contact Parish Clerk to Mildenhall PC to inform them of need to hold extraordinary meeting to agree to re-designation. GS (as Chair of Savernake PC) to pass on information.

3. Site Options

MH explained that the site options were set out at page 12 of the Site Assessment Report (circulated ahead of the meeting). Site A, I and J remained options. Housing at Site E (Barton Dene) had been reduced by approx. two thirds on the withdrawal of Preshute parish. This left a deficit in the number of affordable homes to be found (circa 25). Main points of the discussion were:

- Housing numbers – originally, identified need was 175 of which 94 were now in build or planning leaving 81 to find
- Viability of other land submitted for consideration
- One option was land to the rear of Salisbury Road (the current Redrow development). The landowner could reduce the development from 98 to 50 and still offer 50% affordable on the site (as it had done at Site A – Land off Elcot Lane). It might also trigger the release of a covenant on adjacent land opening up pedestrian and cycling routes into the town centre
- Whether all sites needed to be re-visited to give rationale to the process. If so, this would cause a long delay. Re-visiting existing shortlisted and already assessed sites would be a better option
- Whether a new call for sites would be ethical at such a late stage when assessment work had been completed – looking to a contingency site from the original shortlist might be a more acceptable option
- Sight of any additional technical information received outside of that presented in the Site Assessment Report would be helpful
- All sites going forward would conflict with the protected status of landscape – all were deliverable, but would need mitigation
- Important to be seen to be working within a robust and fair process rather than rush through contingency options
- Whether rural exception sites could be considered as satisfying affordable homes targets
- Whether accepting a reduction of 25 affordable homes would be a sensible compromise which would satisfy the WC minimum requirement of 50 homes
- Affordable housing was the original priority so objective could be revisited
- Most recent Housing Needs Survey work (the Addendum issued by Cobweb Consulting) undertaken on MANP's behalf had shown a need for more than 600 affordable homes up to 2036
- Homes4Wiltshire had changed its policy about homes for local people. Local connection was the second criteria considered under the Allocations Policy and although there are some exceptions to this, such as those fleeing domestic abuse, these are a minority. (*This is set out at:* <https://www.homes4wiltshire.co.uk/content/AboutHomes4Wiltshire/WhyareParishConnectionssoimportant>)
- Windfall sites would also add to affordable housing numbers
- Affordable housing targets could be revisited at the 5-year review stage

It was agreed that a decision was needed on **i)** whether the affordable housing target is retained or reduced and **ii)** if the target is to be retained then which site is to be re-considered

ACTION: SP to circulate additional technical information (largely information submitted following June meetings with landowners as all other site information is contained within the Site Assessment Report produced by OH). A decision on site options to be made at next NPSG

4. Site Assessments Report

This report had been amended to take into account the withdrawal of Preshute parish. The next step was to make a decision on targets. NH confirmed that AECOM will need to validate

its assessment to reflect any changes – its SA/SEA report will not rule out any sites. This will be put on hold. If target is reduced there would be no additional work.

Some proof reading had already taken place with edits forwarded onto OH (keepers of the master copy). Ownership around land adjacent to Kelham Gardens needs to be clarified within the document

ACTION: NH to amend wording to show that the land adjacent to Site I was not in the ownership of MTC.

5. Pre – Submission Document

As with the Site Assessments Report, a decision needed to be made on site options before this could be amended. An issue still remained at MARL18 (Protecting Valued Landscapes Policy) where there remained no mention of:

- 1) North west escarpment from Pantawick along the edge of Savernake Plateau to the Mildenhall/Axford parish boundary at Stitchcombe, including Three Cornered Meadow
- 2) Escarpment from Granham Hill to Manton Grange

All were thanked for passing edits on.

6. Regulation 14

MH confirmed that at that morning's meeting with WC it has been confirmed that the Regulation 14 consultation could not start until the process for area re-designation had been completed. It had though been a useful session on the practicalities of running the consultation (during COVID a static exhibition for visitors would not be possible). Meeting notes are at **Appendix 1**.

7. Finance

SP confirmed that a balance of £2,780 remained in ear marked reserves and £500 in the revenue budget. (OH, Cobweb and Pear Technology invoices had been received and paid). Further work would become increasingly difficult to accommodate. The further £1,000 available from Locality would be set aside for Regulation 14 work.

8. AOB/ Next Meeting

Wiltshire Neighbourhood Planning Alliance – The issues with Malmesbury Neighbourhood Plan (where its Plan had not given it protection against development due to a technical problem around WC's 5 year land supply) had triggered a suggestion for an alliance of Wiltshire NP groups. NH commented that a similar group had been established in Oxfordshire - Oxfordshire Neighbourhood Plans Alliance (<https://onpa.uk/>)

Next Meeting - This would take place, virtually, on Thursday, 6 August at 1.30pm.

Town Clerk

29 July 2020