



**Marlborough Neighbourhood Plan
Steering Group Meeting - 1
Thursday, 14th May at 1.30 pm
Council Chamber, Town Hall,
Marlborough**

Present: Noel Barrett-Morton [NBM], Peter Cairns [PC], Cllr Justin Cook (Marlborough Council) [JC], Cllr Brian Devonshire (Mildenhall Parish Council) [BD], Cllr Stewart Dobson (Wiltshire Councillor) [SD], Cllr Mervyn Hall (Marlborough Town Council) [MH], Marian Hannaford-Dobson [MHD], Susanne Harrison [SH], Jonathan Hinks [JH], Mike Jones [MJ], Ian Mellor [IM], Dr Sam Page (Transition Marlborough) [DSP], Shelley Parker (Town Clerk) [SP], Juliette Plank [JP], Howard Small [HS], Bill Roe (Marlborough College) [BR], Cllr Andrew Smithson (Savernake Parish Council) [AS].

WC – Wiltshire Council – **MNPSG** – Malmesbury Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group – **ToR** – Terms of Reference - **NP** – Neighbourhood Plan – **MTC** – Marlborough Town Council – **NPPF** - National Planning Policy Framework

All were issued with an Information Pack

The meeting was Co-chaired by Cllrs Hall and Cook

1. Welcome, Introductions and Apologies

Following round the table introductions there were apologies from Peter Ridal (Transition Marlborough), Sir Nigel Thompson (Mildenhall Parish Council), James Proyer (Spatial Planning, WC, Link Officer) and Caroline Gibson (Spatial Planning, WC). A handout was circulated, written by Peter Ridal, setting out concerns about the lack of proper transport planning for the town and highlighting that future development would have an impact on traffic and the town's infrastructure.

2. Membership

A Master Skills Matrix had been drawn up which indicated a good mix of required skills. Some new members were still to complete a matrix and once all had been received then the Master would be updated and shared with all SG members, enabling everyone to identify their preferred roles.

Representation was missing from some key organisations - St John's, the Chamber of Commerce, the Medical Practice, etc. It would be vital that these were properly consulted about issues affecting them. (The Doctor's Surgery had already indicated a keenness to be involved but, understandably, could not spare staff to take part in regular meetings). It was possible that temporary representatives might join as required. Representatives from MNPSG had stressed that the work was resource hungry and largely relied on the commitment of a smaller core group.

Another important group of participants would be neighbouring parishes. Representatives from Ogbourne St Andrews, Preshute, Mildenhall and Savernake had all been invited to attend. It would be for each Parish Council to discuss and decide its level of involvement – inclusion in the designated area of the Marlborough Plan or liaison only (see actions at para. 6 below).

ACTION – [SP] to update Master Skills Matrix to include new members then share this with all. [All] to identify a preferred role within the group and time availability.

3. Terms of Reference (ToR)

The MNPSG ToR was the template passed on by WC. This had been issued in 2011/12 and whilst a good starting point was quite complex. It was likely that if Malmesbury was starting the process in 2015, it would be in a different format. It was worth seeking advice from MNPSG on lessons learned. Other, more recent, examples were available. The first step would be to draft a ToR based on templates available, tailoring it to Marlborough's needs.

ACTION – SP to seek advice on lessons learnt from Malmesbury and circulate to SG members. MJ and BR to draft a ToR for the next SG meeting

4. Outcome of Visioning Exercise

The SWOT exercise undertaken during the NP meeting on 24 March was undertaken by only a small number of people and not representative of the whole town. As such, it could not really form the basis of Marlborough's vision or objectives. A much wider visioning exercise was needed. Though early public consultation was not a requirement of the regulations, it would help to gain support and consensus. Part of this could be undertaken online (possibly using the *Engolve* consultation portal) and also include visits to care homes and schools.

It was important to ensure that consultees were aware of what the NP could and could not achieve. Otherwise, aspirations would be unrealistically raised:

- i) It could not offer a carte blanche in terms of planning and land use – it had to be in concert with the Core Strategy and comply with the NPPF
- ii) It could though, within parameters, set down some key local policies that would hold legal weight in the consideration of future planning applications. In general terms, a Plan could give communities a bigger say over the type, location, size, quality and design of development coming forward (including infrastructure, housing and commercial development) as well as tackle long term trends or challenges affecting communities (e.g. need for affordable housing for young people, vacancies in retail units, etc.) It could also forge better partnerships between the town and developers and identify areas where CIL contributions could be used (e.g. maintaining architecture of the Conservation Area).

A carefully worded consultation should be taken forward to set the overall vision. This could be drafted by a Working Party taken from the membership of the group. If possible, this should include the WC Link Officer (James Proyer).

ACTION – SP to arrange for a Working Group meeting to draft questions for a public visioning consultation. SG members will be JC, JP, IM, BR, MHD, PC, NBM, SP + Link Officer

5. Stage 1 – Scoping

Marlborough had started the Stage 1 scoping exercise. A Link Officer had been appointed and he, James Proyer and his Manager, Caroline Gibson had attended the meeting on 24th March.

The public visioning consultation would lead to setting objectives and a Vision Statement. Early indications were that it was likely to focus on:

- **Housing development**
- **Business and employment**
- **Transport (roads, cycling network, footpaths)**
- **Environment**

- **Infrastructure (drainage, schools, medical practices)**
- **Quality of built environment**
- **Use of Brownfield sites**
- **Retail challenges (empty shops)**

The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) - made up of developers contributions - was an important element to the Plan). It would (in part) replace the old S106 Agreements. Towns and parishes would receive 15% of this and where a NP was in place, it would increase to 25%. The remainder of the contribution would be for the Unitary Council. It was important to remember that it was implemented per house (working to a similar formula as a roof tax). CIL contributions would also apply to house extensions of more than 100 square metres.

Housing Allocations - The Core Strategy set out Wiltshire's housing allocation requirements (a total of 42,000). If the Crown Estate Outline Planning Application for development at Salisbury Road was agreed at 220 plus a hotel then this would leave a deficit of 83 houses for Marlborough. With 27 households being created at the former Citroen garage site, this brings down the deficit further to 56. However, the Crown Estate application may not be granted permission with instead a lower number being passed thereby increasing the allocation deficit upwards of 83. Whilst the NP could not influence the Crown Estate application, if produced in time, an NP would allow for local input on additional sites coming forward to meet that deficit or other windfall sites. (There were though already housing allocation options being considered by WC).

Budget – MTC had ear marked £20,000 towards the NP project and had a budget line for 2015/16 of £13,500. Grant funding of £7,000 was also being applied for.

6. Neighbourhood Area Designation

An application would need to be made for the Neighbourhood area designation (this has to be made by the qualifying body – MTC). It is subject to a 6 week consultation period ahead of WC deciding to agree it or not. It would be important to work with neighbouring parishes whether they chose to be part of the designated area or remain outside of it. MNPSG had included 2 of its neighbouring parishes as development crossed parish borders. Agreement on a settlement boundary for Marlborough had not yet been reached. There were no settlement boundaries for small parishes (which included Manton).

How costs, including those associated with the referendum and consultation would be apportioned for a multi-parish Plan was difficult to judge.

Multi-parish NPs were being produced and some had worked well where others had not – it was largely dependent on the size of the geographical spread.

ACTION: SP to investigate referendum and other costs that for circulation to neighbouring parishes. Ogbourne St George, Mildenhall, Savernake and Preshute Parish Councils to be encouraged to discuss this issue at their next meetings

7. AOB

All agreed that meetings at Thursday, 1.30pm were the most appropriate, enabling those with child care responsibilities an opportunity to attend.

ACTION: SP to circulate dates for the Consultation Working Party and next SG Meeting

Town Clerk 15th May 2015