



Marlborough Area Neighbourhood Plan

**Steering Group Meeting
Thursday, 30th June 2016 at 1.30 pm
Council Chamber, Town Hall, Marlborough**

Present: Cllr Mervyn Hall (MTC and Chair) [MH], Cllr Justin Cook (MTC and Vice-Chair) [JC], Susanne Harris [SH], Ian Mellor [IM], Dr Sam Page [DSP], Shelley Parker (Town Clerk) [SP], Bill Roe [BR], and Deirdre Watson [DW]

Glossary of Terms: CCG - Clinical Commissioning Group - DCLG – Department of Communities and Local Government – HNA – Housing Needs Assessment - MTC – Marlborough Town Council – NA - Neighbourhood Area - NP – Neighbourhood Plan - NPSG – Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group - PC – Parish Council – PPG – Patient Participation Group - 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

1. Welcome/Apologies/Matters Arising

MH welcomed all to the meeting. There were apologies from Noel Barrett Morton, Peter Cairns, Cllr Stewart Dobson, Morgan Jones, Peter Ridal, Guy Singleton, Andrew Smithson, Tracy Smith and Sir Nigel Thompson.

As briefly discussed at the meeting of 26th May, [IM] raised the issue of commissioning a transport professional to advise on conflicting transport issues such as inadequate parking (likely to be a frontrunner in terms of local concern) and how this matches up, for example, with air quality issues. All agreed that this was a good suggestion and that the analysis of public feedback would, undoubtedly, provide evidence of this requirement.

2. Open Day and MantonFest

Both events had been successful. More than 150 attended the Open Day and though there was less interest at MantonFest, having a presence helped in getting the message across. The café and quiz had been popular in the Town Hall. Just under 150 feedback forms had been completed with others being returned later. These were being scanned by MTC.

The next stage was analysis of this feedback on both the priority forms and post-it notes. This would be best broken down into clusters that matched the headings of the presentations – Housing, Transport, Environment and Employment. A later task would be to give weighting to the levels of public feedback.

It would be important to be sure that handling of feedback met any test on robustness of consultation.

ACTION: [SH], [BR] and [DSP] to cluster post-it notes and bring result back to next NPSG. [DW] to meet with [SP] to look at examples of how EXCEL can be used as an analytical tool for the priority sheets. (Example spreadsheet to be passed on to others undertaking clustering exercise).

3. Further Roadshows

These should include roadshows at:

- Venues in all 3 parishes (Mildenhall - Village Hall, Preshute - most appropriate venue – Manton Village Hall and Savernake – Savernake Hospital).
- St John's School
- Care Homes
- Business Community - Chamber of Commerce (e.g. a presentation at monthly Business Breakfast)
- Marlborough College, as the largest employer, could offer in-house briefings for its employees.

Timing would be best set for September. Parish representatives to promote at a local level and book venues.

One hard to reach group would be young mothers with small children. One solution would be to engage online particularly via Mumsnet.

The Communication Strategy was key in all of this.

ACTION: **SP** to liaise with St Johns and Care Homes on dates. **DW**, **AS** and **GS** to arrange bookings in parishes. **SP** to arrange for Manton venue (Village Hall). **SP** to send the Communications Strategy to **DW** (as a late entrant to the NPSG, she had not seen the document). **BR** to arrange in-house briefings to staff.

4. Website

JC updated the NPSG confirming that initial problems had been resolved and the content was now much fuller with reference documents, minutes, team details, etc. Drop down menus led to a wide range of information and mapping. Interaction was key with online feedback forms. Some 80 people had already engaged. JC would be drafting a regular newsletter for the site. In view of the complexities of some of the content, it was felt executive summaries from the chairs of Working Parties was vital. JC to continue as webmaster.

It was felt that comments from consultation feedback would be important to include on the website much in the same way as those included on the WC consultation portal. This would help inspire further comment and response.

All agreed that a continuing support package from website providers, InTouch should be arranged. It was unanimously agreed via a vote that this should continue to a ceiling of £1,500.

SP reminded NPSG members that the revenue budget was £2,500 for 2016/17 and that once this was used then money would have to be drawn down from ear marked reserves specifically set aside for the Neighbourhood Plan project.

ACTION: **SH** to draft an executive summary for the Housing Working Party and **DSP** to draft one up for the Environmental and Sustainability Working Party. **SP** to set up an additional support package with InTouch. **JC** to draft newsletter and continue to feed content into the site.

5. Housing Needs Survey

There some issues around the HNA as the SHMA was due to be updated in 2016 and technical data gained from any HNA could not conflict with this. A meeting with the WC lead on Housing was being arranged.

6. Action for the River Kennet (ARK) – Offer of Involvement

This offer was welcomed and it was felt that Project Officer, Anna Forbes, would be an excellent addition to the Environmental Working Party.

ACTION: **SP** to invite Anna Forbes to join the Environmental WP

7. AOB

Landowners - Calls for interest from landowners was an important part of the process but would need to be sensitively handled. IM explained the sequential test that would have to be employed. Potential sites coming forward would have to be measured against a number of planning and environmental implications. This would be about choosing a site with the least harmful effects (i.e. Brownfield sites first). Criteria would be set by Planners. (Planning legislation overrides public opinion). It would be important to log any approaches to the NPSG (some had already been made) and approaches to landowners would also need to be recorded).

Soundness of Plan – IM raised the importance of ensuring that the Plan was evidence-based and he drew specific attention to the 120 spaces available at the new St Mary's Primary School. Even after the estimated 60 spaces to be taken by the new Salisbury Road development, there was no evidence of a requirement for an additional school (e.g.a site for a new Preshute school). JC emphasised that Preshute School was calling for a new site not the NPSG but the NPSG had a duty to follow this through and that the WCS made a reference to the requirement for more school capacity in the longer term.

Statistics – SP felt that it was important to make clear to those engaging with the process on the website that much of the data provided by WC was based on the wider Community Area stats and did not drill down specifically to Marlborough, Mildenhall, Preshute and Savernake. (The Joint Strategic Assessment (JSA) was an example of this.) This could be misleading and confusing to those trying to learn more about the process. WC had a tendency to pull the Community Area together which was not workable and sometimes inaccurate for Neighbourhood Planning purposes.

ACTION: **SP** to ask the Morgan Jones (Link Officer) for guidance on how to find MANP specific stats. **JC** to make clear the origins of stats on the website.

Next Meeting – This was set for *Thursday, 28th July*. It was felt too that an August date should be kept in the diary for a NPSG – *Thursday, 25th August*.

Town Clerk

1st July 2016