



**Marlborough Neighbourhood Plan
Steering Group Meeting
Thursday, 23rd July 2015 at 1.30 pm
Council Chamber, Town Hall,
Marlborough**

Present: Noel Barrett-Morton [NBM], Peter Cairns [PC], Cllr Justin Cook (Marlborough Town Council) [JC], Cllr Mervyn Hall (Marlborough Town Council) [MH], Susanne Harrison [SH], Mike Jones [MJ], Ian Mellor [IM], Shelley Parker (Town Clerk) [SP], Peter Ridal (Transition Marlborough) [PR], Harold Sarsfield (Parish Clerk, Preshute Parish Council) [HS] and Sir Nigel Thompson (Chair, Mildenhall Parish Council) [NT].

WC – Wiltshire Council – **ToR** – Terms of Reference - **NP** – Neighbourhood Plan – **MTC** – Marlborough Town Council – **NPPF** - National Planning Policy Framework – **WCS** – Wiltshire Core Strategy – **WP** – Working Party - **TM** Transition Marlborough – **NPSG** – Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

The meeting was Co-chaired by Cllrs Hall and Cook

1. Welcome, Introductions and Apologies

Following round the table introductions there were apologies from Joe Cunnane, Cllr Stewart Dobson (WC), Jonathan Hinks, Dr Sam Page (Transition Marlborough), Bill Roe (Marlborough College) and Howard Small. Any matters arising were covered in the agenda.

2. Terms of Reference

[MJ] gave a short update on amendments made to the ToR as a result of the NPSG meeting on 18th June (circulated to all). All agreed this was the final draft version. This should be revisited for roles and responsibilities and membership (once the Neighbourhood Area is designated). Further work was needed on a suitable Code of Conduct. Though it covered some pertinent issues (conflict of interests, etc), the version issued by the National Association of Local Councils and used by Marlborough Town Council, was not appropriate for non-Councillors.

ACTION: [MJ] to mark ToR Final V1. [MH] and [SP] to work on wording for an appropriate Code of Conduct

3. Consultation Working Party

[JC] explained that the WP had met twice since the previous meeting. A leaflet for an initial visioning exercise had been drafted (circulated to all). Main points of discussion included that:

- This was a useful document giving clear details around the reasoning behind the NP and how it fitted into the WCS as well as 3 relevant visioning questions
- It should be held until the Neighbourhood Area had been designated and then revisited to ensure that it was relevant to all parishes taking part
- It would be a useful draft for the uninitiated at neighbouring parish level

Amendments - All agreed that at the para. about the WCS and Marlborough, a qualifying sentence should be included under the Pie Chart about how the housing allocation figures related to the wider community area as well as incorporating wording to reflect that housing growth must include 40% affordable housing.

Though initial consultation on visioning was not a statutory requirement under the process and consultation difficult until it was clear which parishes would be joining the town, it would be a good tool to help raise the profile of the exercise in the early stages. Early consultation had been commended by Planning Inspectors for NPs elsewhere.

All agreed that a Communications Strategy would need to be drawn together by the WP before the end of the year.

ACTION: [SP] to make amendments and mark the leaflet V2. Consultation WP to meet again once NP area designation known and to discuss the overarching Communications Strategy.

4. Parish Involvement - Update

[MH] gave a progress report on visits he and [JC] had made to neighbouring parishes.

Feedback was as follows:

- Savernake had decided not to be part of the NP but would like to continue attending NPSG meetings
- Mildenhall had voted unanimously (confirmed by [NT]) in favour of being including in the NP
- Whilst [MH] and [JC] had attended a parish council meeting at Ogbourne, confirmation from Parish Councillors was awaited
- No meeting had yet taken place with Preshute Parish Council. However, [HS] was attending this meeting and confirmed a meeting would be arranged soon

It was important that final decisions by parishes were available soon to enable the area designation to be properly discussed by the NPSG, submitted to MTC for decision as the qualifying body and then for onward submission for decision and consultation by WC.

Whilst parish councils would act on behalf of their parishes, liaising through the NPSG, the WC Link Officer, had confirmed that there could be only one overarching qualifying body – Marlborough Town Council.

ACTION: [HS] to confirm a meeting date for Preshute Parish Council.

5. Designation of Neighbourhood Area – A First Look

A map showing parish boundaries was circulated. It was clear that the largest boundaries with the town involved Mildenhall, Preshute and Savernake. (The latter had already confirmed that it did not want to be part of the NP).

An important factor to consider when finally deciding which parishes to include would be the relevance of how developments might cross boundaries. (A separate question around extending boundaries had been put to WC and was awaiting a response). Also, catchment areas for surgeries, schools, etc. (All set out in James Proyer's e-mail of 26th June and passed on to NPSG members)

Once a decision had been made by parishes on their involvement, then a full discussion should take place. A WP would need to be arranged to complete the Area Designation application form.

The application would be submitted to the Full Council meeting of MTC on 2nd November or an extra-ordinary meeting be called to help progress the application more quickly. There would be a 6 week consultation undertaken by WC taking the process into the New Year.

ACTION: SP to ensure that an item is included on the FTC agenda for 2 November and arrange for an extra-ordinary meeting ahead of this as necessary.

6. AOB/Next Meeting

Referendum Costs – WC had confirmed that WC consultation and referendum costs would be met by WC.

Project Planning – All agreed that some project planning was needed to identify milestones, etc. This could be achieved via a Gant Chart. The best way to undertake this was via a WP. (WC had also signposted members towards a project planning tool at: <http://www.ourneighbourhoodplanning.org.uk/resources/documents>)

Next meeting - Scheduled for Thursday, 3rd September at 1.30pm, Court Room.

Website/Portal – This would be a vital tool in the process and should be a standalone website. There was budget to enable this. It should be a repository for background with a secure log-in for members to share information. Social media would also be a key element of this.

ACTION: MH, MJ, JC and PR to form Project Planning WP. SP to e-mail members with relevant web experience for a steer on a way forward for a dedicated website

Town Clerk 24th July 2015