



Marlborough Area Neighbourhood Plan

Steering Group Meeting
Thursday, 25 July 2019 at 1.30pm, Council Chamber, Town Hall,
Marlborough

Present: Cllr Mervyn Hall (Chair) [MH], Cllr Peter Cairns [PC], Noel Barrett-Morton [NBM], Cllr Stewart Dobson (WC) [SD], Susanne Harris [SH], Shelley Parker (Town Clerk) [SP], Deborah Schofield (TM), [DS], Guy Singleton (Savernake PC) [GS] and Sir Nigel Thompson [SNT]

Glossary of Terms: **ARK** – Action for the River Kennet - **CCG** - Clinical Commissioning Group - **HNA** – Housing Needs Assessment – **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 – **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. Apologies/Matters Arising/Clearance of Minutes

Apologies were received from Morgan Jones (WC), Ian Mellor, Bill Rowe (MC), Bridget Strong (TM) and Dierdre Watson. MH informed everyone that a letter had been written to Marlborough.News by a member of the public about his dissatisfaction with MANP and its informal consultation. There were a number of inaccuracies in the letter, but it was agreed that no action should be taken.

2. Informal Consultation

All four of the drop-in exhibitions (at Manton Village Hall, Marlborough Town Hall, the Area Board and Mildenhall Village Hall) had gone well and had been well attended. Feedback had been good and comments were that it was a welcome exercise ahead of the Regulation 14 exercise later in the year. The consultation was available online and would run to 2 August. SP explained that the next stage would be to draw the data together. The online version would come complete with analytics, graphs and pie charts. The approach with hard copy forms would be to manually enter data onto Excel sheets or, alternatively, enter each feedback form into the online consultation. All agreed that the latter was the best solution.

It was also agreed that SP should draw the results into a report to be publicly available (this had not been done in 2016/17 though some NPSG members had written reports about topic areas). The aim was for this work to be complete by the end of August.

ACTION: [SP] to talk to the Town Council's webmaster about the possibility of [PC] entering data into the online consultation.

3. Possible School Sites

The Call for Sites had been handled separately and four potential school sites had come forward. These had not been included as part of the informal consultation as none had yet been assessed against criteria. MH, SP and MJ had attended a meeting at Preshute School with the interim Head Teacher and the Head of School Place Commissioning at WC. Any new school would need to be built in the catchment area (which did not cover the

whole of Marlborough). WC had a preference for one of the sites put forward though any new build would be based on funding and need.

Current attendance at the school was:

Within catchment area (including Barton Park)	85
Wider Marlborough area	60
Kennet Valley	16
Further afield	31
Manton Village	11

All agreed that any sites being put forward to replace Preshute School must be subject to a separate consultation with parents and Manton Village. The Head of Preshute Primary School and Head of School Place Commissioning should be kept informed of progress.

ACTION: Assessment of the 4 sites for the school to be arranged

4. Feedback from WC Workshop

SD and SP gave feedback on the WC Workshop they attended on 16 July. Main points were:

- That it had been particularly useful in terms of explanations about the processes for Regulations 14, 15 and 16 and the referendum.
- That there was little advice in terms of design guidance and it would be important to cover this adequately in the NP (a draft policy was being put forward and a question had been included on it in the informal consultation)
- The presentation on Community Land Trusts (CLTs) had been useful and it had confirmed that town and parish councils could form a CLT, but were better placed to facilitate the process for voluntary bodies. One way forward would be to discuss the possibility of land being handed over gratis by a developer for the purpose of a CLT. Of housing built under this scheme, 50% were allocated under the rules set by WC/Housing Association and the other 50% fell to the CLT to manage and set its own restrictions (e.g. local occupants only).

5. Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)

WC had confirmed that an SEA was needed and funding had been confirmed from Locality for AECOM to undertake the work (this would include a Sustainability Assessment too). Two telephone conversations had taken place and documents passed on. It was hoped that AECOM could meet with NPSG representatives in late August to go over the initial findings. It was thought too that all being well, we could be on target to hold the Regulation 14 work in November/December though it was advised that it should really extend to mid-January to properly cover the Christmas period.

Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) – It had been confirmed via MJ and WC's Ecologist that an HRA would not be needed. Helpful advice about the sites put forward had been passed to us (and subsequently passed on to AECOM). This clearly set out that each site would need to show a net gain for biodiversity and so it was likely that in terms of development, estimated housing numbers would be spread over at least 2 sites.

ACTION: SP to invite AECOM to attend next NPSG meeting

6. Draft Site Assessment

OH had drafted a Site Assessment. This was not yet finished and needed maps, but the NPSG went through it, made some amendments and raised questions to pass back.

The Police Station was listed though its future was still undetermined. In spite of attempts by the NPSG, the Surgery and SD, the PCC was still reluctant to offer a visit to ascertain its

suitability for allocating it within the Plan even though the Deputy Chief Executive had confirmed a willingness to be part of the NP process

ACTION: SP to pass Site Assessment changes to OH. SP to again contact the PCC asking for a visit, copied to other relevant addressees.

7. Website

All agreed that at this stage, the MANP site would be best transferred to dedicated pages on the Town Council website. It was not clear how this could be done though it was likely that users could be re-directed via a link to the new pages.

ACTION: SP to confirm contractual conditions. PC to arrange a meeting with website providers

8. AOB/Next Meeting

Land at Mildenhall – One of the sites put forward at Mildenhall did not exactly match the one put forward during the Call for Sites exercise. These changes could well offer a better proposition for the village. It could involve the possibility of the affordable/enabling housing being split over 2 sites. Whatever the outcome, a standalone second consultation would be needed in the village. This could be arranged to coincide with the next parish meeting on 9 September. It would be important to find out from OH:

- Whether the potential housing sites in Mildenhall could be viewed as exception sites
- If affordable housing could be split over 2 sites with one site possibly taking all or a large proportion of the affordable element

ACTION: SP to arrange for a map of the new sites and clear it with the landowner and, at the same time, confirm site access. SP to seek OH's advice on the questions raised about the sites in Mildenhall as listed above.

The next NPSG meetings would be Thursday, 5 September 2019 at 1.30pm in the Council Chamber.

Town Clerk

26 July 2019