



# Marlborough Area Neighbourhood Plan

**Steering Group Meeting**  
**Thursday, 31<sup>st</sup> May 2018 at 1.30 pm**  
**Council Chamber, Town Hall, Marlborough**

**Present:** Cllr Mervyn Hall (Chair) **[MH]**, Noel Barrett-Morton **[NB-M]**, Cllr Peter Cairns **[PC]**, Cllr Stewart Dobson **[SD]**, Susanne Harris **[SH]**, Morgan Jones (WC) **[MJ]**, Dr Sam Page **[DSP]**, Shelley Parker (Town Clerk) **[SP]**, Guy Singleton (Savernake PC) **[GS]**, Sir Nigel Thompson **[SNT]** and Deirdre Watson (Mildenhall PC) **[DW]**

**Glossary of Terms:** **ARK** – Action for the River Kennet - **CCG** - Clinical Commissioning Group - **DCLG** – Department of Communities and Local Government – **HNA** – Housing Needs Assessment - **MTC** – Marlborough Town Council – **NA** - Neighbourhood Area – **NFU** – National Farmers Union - **NP** – Neighbourhood Plan - **NPSG** – Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group - **PC** – Parish Council – **PPG** – Patient Participation Group – **SBC** – Swindon Borough Council - **SHLAA** – Strategic Housing 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

There were apologies from Ian Mellor and Bill Roe. With one minor amendment, the minutes of the meeting of 26<sup>th</sup> April were approved.

### 2. Updates

Kelham Gardens - MH updated all about progress on the sale of land at Kelham Gardens (adjacent to the former Gas Works site) and owned by WC. As reported at the previous meeting, WC had not agreed to an asset transfer of the land. WC had an obligation to sell the land at best value (under S123 of the Local Government Act 1972). However, this might be considered for sale for a lesser amount if it could be proved that the land is of social value (i.e. meeting a real community need). The Chairman and Town Clerk had sent a letter setting out this case linking it to evidenced parking need. The acquisition of the land would be conditional on each side (e.g. no purchase without planning permission and sale only for parking use). MTC had commissioned a valuation and was working through a pre-planning application with its consultants. A decision was likely to be made by the end of July.

Permission in Principle – Aimed at smaller developers building up to 9 dwellings on one site, this new planning consent route was an alternative way of obtaining planning permission which separates the consideration of matters of principle for proposed development from the technical detail of the development. The permission in principle consent route has 2 stages: the first stage (or permission in principle stage) establishes whether a site is suitable in-principle for residential development and the second ('technical details consent') stage is when the detailed development proposals are assessed. The turnaround time for consultees for the first stage (permission in principle) is 2 weeks which may affect those smaller councils whose meeting cycles fall outside of this short timeframe. The changes come into effect on 1 June 2018.

### 3. Wiltshire Housing Site Allocations Plan

Following a consultation in spring 2017, the Plan had been amended to take in relevant consultation feedback. There was now a consultation on those changes and details had been circulated to NPSG members. The main changes to the settlement boundary included changes around the Marlborough College site and College Fields. MANP had, in the original

consultation, raised the issue of Manton not being included in the settlement boundary when it was within the parish of Marlborough. The Spatial Planning team at WC had confirmed that this was because it was treated as a standalone village and that it would be covered by the countryside and rural policies set out in the WCS.

MANP had also raised the issue about Mildenhall not being listed in the table at 2.3 as part of the Community Area (neither was it listed in the WCS).

It remained that the settlement boundary can still be changed by the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.

All agreed that the points about the exclusion of Manton from the Marlborough settlement boundary should again be raised together with the exclusion of Mildenhall. Also that the settlement boundary may change following the publication of the Neighbourhood Plan

**ACTION: SP to respond to the consultation ahead of the 11 June deadline**

#### **4. Home Building Goes Local**

A number of NPSG members had signposted the group to a new scheme whereby WC was helping communities provide affordable homes with cash from a Government fund reserved for local housing projects. This was being dealt with via Wiltshire Community Land Trust and Community First which were helping neighbourhood groups develop new affordable housing in their communities. The support available would be to provide advice and access funding (circa £10,000) to set up a Community Land Trust.

DSP also pointed out a good website dealing with how to make the case for community-led housing on public land - [http://neweconomics.org/2018/05/making-the-case/?mc\\_cid=62464210fc&mc\\_eid=724045534d](http://neweconomics.org/2018/05/making-the-case/?mc_cid=62464210fc&mc_eid=724045534d)

All agreed that more information should be obtained via WC's Community Engagement Manager.

**ACTION: SP to liaise with Andrew Jack, CEM about setting up a meeting to find out more about the new Land Trust scheme**

#### **5. Draft Scoping Document**

All agreed that the draft MANP Scope document was good and captured the land use requirements well. Main points discussed were:

- That the 3 Conservation Area Atatements relevant to MANP (Marlborough, Manton and Mildenhall) should be reviewed
- More was needed on the Natural Environment - a policy on river banks and ARK's contribution should be included
- More emphasis on the constraints/benefits of the AONB was needed
- Coach parking should be referred to with transport and parking
- A policy on the development of tourism was needed (to include a reference to the Great West Way). This could include references to B&Bs, extra car parking, campsites, etc.

**ACTION: MH to update the Scope Document**

#### **6. Feedback from all Working Groups**

Countryside, Recreation and Nature Conservation - A meeting had taken place on 4<sup>th</sup> May and SH outlined the main points:

- Main headings for inclusion were Farming, Forestry and Tree Preservation, Rivers (Og and Kennet), Saving Green Spaces and Protection of AONB and SSSIs.
- Within each of those headings issues had been identified backed up by evidence (letters and statements from the NFU and Forestry Commission)

- Policy proposals were also put forward and additional comment
- On recreation it was suggested that the parishes should look at WC's Open Spaces Policy document where there were a number of inaccuracies that needed reviewing
- Outstanding work included obtaining feedback from AONB.

A second meeting had also taken place on 24<sup>th</sup> May with the Director and Project Officer for ARK. This was to identify specific areas with regards to the River Kennet, water usage and sustainable drainage in preparation to drafting strong and realistic policies for the Neighbourhood Plan. As set out in a previous document from ARK circulated to NPSG members, a number of suggested actions and policies had been put forward which would fit in and encourage better planning for new homes and related infrastructure.

As pointed out by MJ and MH, many policies were already in place in terms of flooding, drainage and SUDs as part of the WCS. However, local policies relating to land use could help to emphasise this at a local level and for new sites (policies could not be retrospective).

All thanked the SH and the Working Party for this thorough piece of scoping work.

***Both meeting reports/scoping drafts would be circulated to all members with the minutes.***

Business & Employment – This group had met on 30<sup>th</sup> April and notes were due to be written up by IM. This would be reported back to the next NPSG Meeting.

**ACTION: SP to circulate CRNC Working Group documents. IM to write up scoping doc for B&W Working Group. Other WGs to also report back to next NPSG meeting.**

## **7. Call for Sites/Assessment of Sites**

Following the withdrawal of consultants for this exercise, SP had sought another one. A key obstacle had been that most did not undertake the call for sites, only the site assessment. This was usually done in-house and something this group would need to consider doing for itself but, working with a consultant to undertake the site assessment.

It was common for steering groups to reach a cul-de-sac at this stage and where professional handholding was key. (This had happened in other Wiltshire towns). Guidance on site assessment, the sustainability appraisal, policy writing and examination was usually needed.

Another consultant had been identified with much experience in the field and had worked with groups up and down the country. It was now also working with towns and parishes with 'made' plans, now looking at reviews. A representative had offered to come to Marlborough on 19<sup>th</sup> June to discuss working with MANP. Background documents had been sent to the company - first comments were that MANP was working well towards Plan publication. This meeting could take place at 2pm in the Council Chamber. All NPSG members were welcome to attend.

**ACTION: SP to confirm meeting with consultant as 19<sup>th</sup> June at 2pm in the Council Chamber. All NPSG members welcome to attend go ahead.**

## **8. Website**

PC confirmed that he would be discussing the website with the provider (hosting and support had been put into place for an additional 2 years). Some information was still missing from the site. It was agreed that that links to national policies (e.g. NPPF) should be included. First drafts of policies and Working Group reports should not be posted on line at this stage.

**ACTION: PC to post relevant links onto website**

## **9. Finances**

SP confirmed that the balance in the revenue budget for 2018/19 was £2,476 and that there was an ear marked reserve of £20,152. The new Locality grants scheme had been announced and would continue for at least the next Financial Year.

## **10. AOB/Next Meeting**

Costs passed onto householders – MH asked whether it was common for developers to pass on costs to householders. This was particularly relevant for the new Redrow development. He had been informed that those at a recently built retirement complex had seen their management fees increase by as much as 40% in the last year or so. MJ commented that this was increasingly the case where play areas and other amenities would have to be paid for when not taken on long term by the developer or local authority. Often management companies were set up to deal with this. It was sometimes the case that roads were not adopted until after quite a delay whilst problems were ironed out (e.g. roads on the housing estate at St Johns). It all largely depended on the documents drawn up between the developer and house purchaser.

Swindon Housing Market Area – SD confirmed that a liaison committee was to be formed to look at the new housing area that brought in towns in the north of the county together with Swindon. This would be made up of 3 SBC and 3 WC Councillors. All WC representatives were from the south of the county. SD would be asking for further clarification on this with a senior Planning Officer. He would also find out about the possibility of a MANP representatives meeting with this group.

A reminder was made to all that Working Groups must report scoping exercises back to the next NPSG meeting.

Next meeting – The next meeting will take place **on Thursday, 28<sup>th</sup> June 2018 at 1:30pm in the Council Chamber.**

**Town Clerk - May 2018**