



# Melksham Neighbourhood Plan

## Steering Group Meeting

Date: Wednesday 30 November 2022  
Start: 6.30 pm

### Present:

#### Steering Group Members Present

Councillor David Pafford Chair (MWPC)  
Councillor Alan Baines (MWPC Sub)  
Councillor Graham Ellis (MTC)  
Councillor Pat Aves (MTC)  
John Hamley (MTUG)  
Councillor Mike Sankey (WC)  
Shirley McCarthy (Environment)  
Mark Blackham (Bowerhill Residents Action Group)

#### Officers

Teresa Strange (MWPC)  
Lorraine McRandle (MWPC)  
Linda Roberts (MTC)

### Task Group Members:

Councillor Mark Harris (MPWC)  
Councillor Colin Goodhind (MTC)

### Planning Consultants:

Vaughan Thompson (Place Studio)

<b>MTC</b>	<b>Melksham Town Council</b>
<b>MWPC</b>	<b>Melksham Without Parish Council</b>
<b>WC</b>	<b>Wiltshire Council</b>
<b>MTUG</b>	<b>Melksham Transport User Group</b>

## MINUTES

### 1. Welcome & Housekeeping

Councillor Pafford welcomed everyone to the meeting and went through the fire evacuation procedures for the building and introduced new steering group member, Mark Blackham, Chair of Bowerhill Residents Action Group (BRAG).

### 2. To note apologies

The Parish Clerk informed the meeting that apologies had been received from Chris Holden, but had not heard from Colin Harrison. The meeting was informed Councillor Glover was on a leave of absence from the parish council and therefore Councillor Baines was in attendance as substitute.

### **3. Declarations of Interests & Register of Interests**

There were no declarations of interest.

It was noted Mark Blackham had completed a Register of Interest Form prior to the meeting with everyone else present having previously signed a Declaration of Interest form.

### **4. Public Participation**

There were no members of public present; other than Task Group members.

### **5. To agree Minutes of Meeting held on 28 September 2022**

**Resolved:** To approve and for the Chair to sign the minutes of the meeting held on 28th September 2022.

### **6. a) To receive Progress and Programme Update Briefing and agreed next steps**

Vaughan provided a progress update since the last Steering Group meeting explaining a new content page for the plan had been produced which had 7 updated policy areas and two new policies added and will start to draw down the work people have been undertaking in recent months and install in the new plan.

Vaughan explained there was no need to reinvent the wheel, but to update policies and background information, as things both locally and nationally have changed since the current plan was drafted.

#### **Topic Areas:**

#### **Sustainable Development and Climate Change**

**Policy 1: Sustainable Design and Construction. Update**

**Policy 2: Local Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation Update**

Vaughan explained a topic paper had been prepared to inform updates to policies 1 & 2 which had been circulated to the Steering Group, with good progress being made on this topic, which was keeping close to programme in terms of progress.

#### **Housing and Infrastructure**

**Policy 6: Housing in Defined Settlements: Updated**

**Policy 7: Allocation(s) Updated**

#### **Policy 6: Housing in Defined Settlements**

Vaughan explained Policy 6 would be updated and where necessary insert reference to the Housing Needs Assessment. The Housing Needs Assessment completed by AECOM is a key document in providing supporting

evidence to inform the update of the policy and link the delivery of housing in principle, regardless of where it is, back to housing that will respond to the identified local need. The document can now be used as evidence to inform on any proposals coming forward from developers.

The Parish Clerk explained that the Housing Needs Assessment was already being used by Planning Officers at Wiltshire Council as evidence for querying the housing size mix on large developments and was being passed to developers that they were meeting at pre-application stage.

Vaughan explained the housing site allocations process was currently underway and must be followed. Since the last meeting, AECOM has been progressing the assessment of all the sites which have been put forward as they were on the Strategic Housing & Employment Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) list and/or had come forward following the Steering Group call for sites. The methodology used to shift through the various sites had been agreed with AECOM and the Steering Group at the last meeting.

The Parish Clerk explained it was hoped the initial sifting of the 90 sites would be finished later that week, with AECOM verifying their findings either before Christmas or just after. They hoped to have a draft report in February with their recommendation on those sites which had come through the sift.

Unfortunately, there were a few sites where it was hard to identify the exact landowner, therefore an application had been sent to the Land Registry seeking the relevant information and hopefully this would be received shortly. However, in the meantime those sites would remain on the list and assessed by AECOM until there is an opportunity to talk to the landowner and confirmed to proceed or removed from the list if they do not want the site to be considered.

Vaughan explained there had been a little bit of slippage on this process, as originally it had been hoped this would have been done by January 2023. When the report comes back, the steering group will need to assess the sites and therefore it was important at the next meeting to validate the document to allow the shortlisting process to begin. The report will give insight into the shortlisted sites by AECOM, with the Steering Group then undertaking the site selection process. This will include landowner consultation with those short listed to see if those sites are still available and to talk to them on their intentions in terms of meeting the community's policy aspirations and policy requirements on their sites.

Vaughan explained the Steering Group were updating the Neighbourhood Plan in order to re-establish National Planning Policy, Paragraph 14 protection<sup>1</sup> which only lasts for 2 years. Current protection can be enjoyed until July 2023, establishing plan led control of development in the

---

1

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/1005759/NPPF\\_July\\_2021.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1005759/NPPF_July_2021.pdf)

Neighbourhood Plan area, despite the fact there is no 5-year land supply in Wiltshire.

The only way to get the protection back is for the Neighbourhood Plan to allocate sites for housing in a meaningful number, which is about 10% of the total amount of housing which will come to Melksham through the Local Plan up to 2036.

Vaughan explained the only figure which has been published was 18 months ago in the Local Plan Review consultation and was the only number the steering group could work on i.e. an allocation of 2500 houses in Melksham and a separate allocation of 90 for Whitley and Shaw. Therefore, looking at an allocation of approximately 260 homes in the Neighbourhood Plan.

As the Local Plan is not allocating sites at Shaw & Whitley, only providing a housing allocation number, the Neighbourhood Plan has an opportunity to take the lead in whatever the whole number is for Shaw & Whitley and rural areas, so it's likely the Neighbourhood Plan is looking for in the region of 90 homes provided in Shaw & Whitley and other rural settlements and 10% of the figure which comes forward for Melksham.

Unfortunately, the final housing figure allocation will not be known until Summer 2023. Therefore, the Steering Group will have to work on a Melksham housing figure of 2,500 until the Regulation 14 draft plan. Unfortunately, Wiltshire Council officers are not mandated by their own Cabinet to inform the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group what the figure is.

Councillor Pafford asked when in the formulation of the revised Neighbourhood Plan it would hold weight against subsequent housing planning applications.

Vaughan informed the meeting he would look further into whether protection disappeared completely or if it was a disintegrating amount of protection as time went on, but felt protection would not disappear completely, but would be a disintegrating amount of protection. It is all about how up to date the plan was, after two years a plan would not be completely out of date, just two years old, therefore would be able to look to Paragraph 14 protection beyond July to defend against unwanted planning applications.

Vaughan reminded the group there was already a made neighbourhood plan and local policies and therefore could still use this after July and still have the full weight of the neighbourhood plan. With regard to the new plan, it had limited planning weight until it was submitted successfully to Wiltshire Council after Regulation 14, in order for them to take forward. After Regulation 14 there would be evidence of community engagement and therefore would know how much objection there is to certain policies and those policies where there is no objection were therefore likely to pass through and would attain greater weight at this stage. Each stage provides greater weight i.e. the act of Wiltshire Council accepting the plan as a document fit for purpose to take

forward to the next stages of the process; the examination and what the Examiner says; the Referendum and finally the making of the plan.

The Parish Clerk asked if the fact that it was a current plan under review gave it more weight than a brand new plan.

Vaughan explained the plan had full weight now and still would in July and when the reviewed plan got through examination and referendum, the only thing dented, would be the ability to resist speculative housing development, due to Paragraph 14 protection running out.

Vaughan explained as the Steering Group were currently updating 7 policies, pushing them forward to 2036, the update would give a subtle uplift into the future and they would have full weight going forward. The housing allocation would have less weight, because no one can defend so fully against unsustainable development, whether Local Plan or Neighbourhood Plan. If the plan gets to examination, the Inspector gives less weight to things like design or quality of the development, which is nothing to do with the Neighbourhood Plan weight, but to do with not having a 5-year housing land supply after Paragraph 14.

Mark Blackham asked where the 2,500 housing figure came from and if it was an arbitrary figure or based on local needs.

Vaughan explained the housing figure came from Wiltshire Council and was a required figure for housing growth within the Local Plan and given by central Government. The figure being a combination of calculating population change in Wiltshire together with the Government target for national housing growth and therefore a formula for producing a housing figure. The figure is then divided into Housing Market Areas (HMAs), with Wiltshire being divided into several HMAs and worked out using population statistics for what the growth in these areas is and having done this arrive at a housing figure for each HMA, then divided between settlements in the HMA. In the draft Local Plan policy at present, the emerging strategy is to increase the proportion of growth in Melksham, as opposed to Chippenham, there is less growth in Trowbridge for instance, which is in the Trowbridge HMA.

Mark asked if it was known approximately what the proportion of 2,500 homes is to the current housing in Melksham.

Vaughan explained he did not know the figure, but would investigate.

Mark Blackham stated if there were approximately 1,000 homes in Bowerhill, which equated to 3,000 people for instance, an additional 2,500 homes would effectively be making a Bowerhill and a half, which seemed extreme and therefore was there an expectation the population of Melksham would grow this significantly.

Vaughan explained it was a strategic issue, as Wiltshire Council had a strategy where they have recognised in their opinion that Melksham is

suitable for a more strategic level of growth, which came down to the likelihood of a potential bypass and due to less constraints to the land around parts of Melksham to make it possible to accommodate larger amounts of development and agreed it was a substantial amount of growth up to 2036 and stressed this was not a Neighbourhood Plan issue but a Local Plan issue, as the Neighbourhood Plan could not change the housing figures quoted by having an alternative housing figure.

Council Baines stated he believed the new housing figure for Wiltshire up to 2036 was 42,000. Wiltshire Council having looked at the various HMAs in the County allocated housing figures to each including Chippenham HMA which includes Melksham, Calne, Malmesbury, Corsham and others. Wiltshire Council has determined Melksham has fewer constraints than other areas in the Chippenham HMA, such as quality of agricultural land and access to Melksham is better. The housing figure for Melksham up to 2036 was 4,000, however, with various commitments which have already been approved this figure came down to 2,500, with new sites having to be identified which will be a strategic issue, with the neighbourhood plan looking at smaller sites for 10% of this figure.

Councillor Ellis regarding the question of what proportion of housing compared to current, explained the current population of both Melksham and Melksham Without was approximately 25,000 (bearing in mind census figures for 2021 were due to be produced shortly this figure may change) therefore estimated 10,000 homes, with 2,500 additional homes providing an uplift of approximately 25%.

Shirley McCarthy explained in the Housing Needs survey it stated there were 9,151 households occupying 9,364 dwellings, therefore, the housing figure equated to an additional third and sought clarification having read somewhere if HMAs were being done away with and whether current activities at Government level would change the level of housing required.

Councillor Pafford stated the meeting needed to move on as it was all speculative and understood there were things happening at Government level which may change things.

John Hamley asked if the 2,500 housing figure was a given and could it be changed.

Councillor Pafford clarified the housing figure will be that which is allocated in the Local Plan and therefore would need to work on assumption the figure will not change at this stage. Unfortunately, it was not the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan to change the figure.

Vaughan confirmed it was not for the Neighbourhood Plan to make a representation on the number of houses Wiltshire's Local Plan is proposing, but for the town and parish council to make representations, which they have, with another opportunity to make representation as the Local Plan progresses.

Vaughan explained when the choices are made for potential sites to be allocated through the Neighbourhood Plan, as there is a need to get on with the plan in order to hold Paragraph 14 protection, the development allocation move to community consultation at the Regulation 14 stage (formal stage of consultation) once validated by the steering group and then put before the two councils. Given time constraints, Vaughan recommended there be no informal consultation, but move straight to formal, however, it was up to the steering group and this decision could be made at a future steering group meeting.

### **Working, Shopping and getting around**

#### **Policy 9: Town centre**

Vaughan explained this was about Policy 9 and the town centre, with a commitment in the current Neighbourhood Plan, particularly in the Priority Statement about creating the town centre masterplan. Good progress had been made on this with a draft of the town centre masterplan coming forward, however, there was still a bit of fine tuning to be made. The Town Centre Masterplan group had secured some additional support for a car parking study to go with the masterplan.

The Town Clerk explained the car park owners have been written to and were awaiting to hear back, however, Wiltshire Council has written back giving permission.

Vaughan explained it was hoped to bring the draft masterplan to the next meeting for validation by the Steering Group and clarified it was not part of the Neighbourhood Plan, but a guidance and strategy document to support the delivery of Policy 9, with the Town Centre policy itself requiring a slight update.

Once the Steering Group had validated the Town Centre Masterplan stakeholder and community engagement will need to take place.

#### **Policy 10 – Employment Sites**

Vaughan explained only a minor update was required on this policy. It may be that an employment site is allocated in the plan, such as the Christie Miller site, which has come forward in the call for sites from Wiltshire Council for employment use. The Neighbourhood Plan has an opportunity to secure this as an employment site.

### **Community wellbeing and nature**

Vaughan explained a new policy of local green space designations had been created.

Lorraine explained 49 sites remained after short listing with the various landowners being written to having until 18th December to respond. The majority of sites belonged to Wiltshire Council and they would be looking at the list on 12th December and reporting back. The Land Registry had been

contacting regarding the ownership details of one outstanding site and were currently waiting to hear back.

Vaughan explained the target was to bring final list to go into the plan at the next Steering Group meeting.

**Natural built environment:**

Vaughan explained a new Green Gap Policy would be included in this section, having been agreed at a previous meeting. In hindsight, there had been an omission in the current Neighbourhood Plan with not having a Green Gap Policy and whilst the Appeal was not lost because no policy had been included, if it had been included, it would have helped following the Appeal being allowed in Berryfield.

Vaughan explained whilst the policy itself was not difficult to write, the evidence of where the green gaps were needed to be done robustly by a professional, with a brief being approved at the last meeting. A significant amount of work had been done to get the work underway by a consultant and were now in a position where Locality are considering awarding free consultant technical support, but this has taken longer than anticipated. The Town Clerk explained both councils had allocated funding towards creating a policy, in case the free technical support was not forthcoming.

The Parish Clerk explained Locality had approved the technical support, however, the request was currently sat with the Department of Levelling Up, waiting to say Locality could have the money, which was frustrating, as previously AECOM had agreed to undertake the work, which was the speediest way to get the work done but unfortunately had subsequently stated they did not have capacity to undertake the work involved.

Councillor Aves asked if Michelle Donelan MP could chase this up on behalf of the Steering Group.

Vaughan felt it was perfectly reasonable to ask for something to be expedited in the public interest and whilst there was a delay on getting the work done on creating a Green Gap policy, it would not take as long as the Housing Policy, which would take longer.

The parish clerk asked if the response was going to be no from the Department of Levelling Up, or it was going to take an unreasonable amount of time to undertake the work, if delegated powers could be given to both Clerks to use the money allocated by both councils in order to appoint someone to undertake the Green Gap policy work, if necessary, prior to the next Steering Group meeting, which may be some time off.

**Resolved:** To give delegated powers to both Clerks to appoint a consultant to undertake the Green Gap Policy work, if Vaughan felt time was moving on and it was going to cause a significant delay in the time line of the Neighbourhood Plan Review.

## **Policy 18: Locally Distinctive Design, High Quality Design: Design Codes**

Vaughan explained there would be a subtle update to this policy with the inclusion of character design codes. Whilst there was a snap shot character appraisal in the existing Neighbourhood Plan, the work undertaken on design codes will take the Policy further forward in a greater level of detail. The work undertaken on this had been undertaken as part of technical support by AECOM and a draft document reviewed by the task group and comments pulled together. It was not too late to add more information, if members of the Steering Group wished to add comments.

The Parish Clerk explained herself and the Town Clerk would look at it themselves too and forward to members of the Steering Group who had requested to see it, for comment.

It was explained Planning Authorities can turn down a planning application if something is not good design but it is hard to define what this is. Both the Parish Council and Urban Design Officer at Wiltshire Council, in commenting on proposals for 144 homes on Semington Road (PL/2022/02749) had said it was poorly designed. Once the Neighbourhood Plan had design codes included which stated in the various areas what is good design and what is not this provided the evidence to refuse an application if it did not match the design codes within the Neighbourhood Plan; removing the ambiguity of what “good design” was in the Melksham NHP area.

Vaughan explained the character and design code was not something which needed to wait for the updated Neighbourhood Plan to be made before it could be used, as the Neighbourhood Plan already had a design policy.

Vaughan suggested some training on the design codes in order both council’s planning committees were up to speed with the content.

**Resolved:** For the Design Codes to be sent to Melksham Without Parish & Melksham Town Council’s Planning Committees for review and validation, once approved by the Steering Group.

## **Policy 19: Local Heritage**

Graham Ellis as lead on the Heritage Working Group, explained Heritage Assets were in addition to listed buildings, of which there were over 200 listed in Neighbourhood Plan area with 12-20 items included on the heritage asset list which had been thoroughly researched. There was still a little bit of work to be undertaken and then landowners could be contacted.

Graham thanked those who had been involved in providing research on this topic.

The Parish Clerk explained Paul Carter Jnr had joined the group, as Chair of the Historical Association. Graham explained it would be useful for him to have a look at the list of assets in order to provide a sanity check.

### **Priority Statements**

Vaughan explained there were a few of these included in the current plan, which provided statements on how the community wanted to see things move forward, what it supports and what is being done by other people, with an opportunity to up-date these as things have moved on:

**Priority Statement 1: Wiltshire Local Plan Review (which is progressing).**

**Priority Statement 2: Town centre regeneration**

**Priority Statement 3: Transport Infrastructure – Bypass.**

Vaughan explained it had been debated whether to include this and whether it could be supported or not.

The Parish Clerk explained National Highways were currently looking at the best strategic route via the Western Gateway to Poole. If the A350 was shown to be the best route, this strengthened the business case for a bypass and would be out of Wiltshire Council's hands, as it would be a Government project. If the study found the A350 was not the best route, this would weaken the business case for a bypass, unfortunately, the report was not expected to be completed until Summer 2023. It was also unknown if there would be a protected route for the bypass in the Local Plan.

**Priority Statement 5: Wilts & Berks Canal Restoration**

It was explained it was unclear if there would be a protected route of the canal in the Local Plan, as there is in the current Core Strategy and whether it would be the same route as the 2012 planning application.

Vaughan explained proposals for the canal had issues, such as the levels of housing growth required as part of enabling development which would be of a strategically large level. Whether it came with a large amount of housing would be something dealt with by Wiltshire Council. At the moment the Steering Group is not in a position to amend this Priority Statement as there is not enough information.

Vaughan explained the Priority Statements needed to be up to date and not in conflict with the Local Plan, as by law a Neighbourhood Plan had to conform to a Local Plan and not be in conflict with a different strategy. Luckily, Priority Statements could wait until the end and could change again after Regulation 14 consultation, if circumstances changed before the plan is submitted to Wiltshire Council.

**Strategic Environment Assessment (SEA)**

This needed to be undertaken on the whole of the updated plan, particularly as it would include housing allocations, which may have a significant environmental impact. The SEA would look at the impact and mitigations the plan has in it, to remove or minimise these.

Vaughan explained the assessment work had already started through Locality technical support, thanks to the Link Officer at Wiltshire Council, with the work

currently ongoing and could not be completed until it was known how much housing was being allocated in the Neighbourhood Plan, which created a risk to the Neighbourhood Plan programme, as the work needed to be done by an external party towards the end of the review.

Vaughan informed the meeting that it was previously understood that a draft SEA had to be completed and then go to Regulation 14 consultation. However, there were some case studies, including Chippenham, where the SEA had not been finished but the Regulation 14 process started, which was good news as this sped up the process and David Way as the Link Officer at Wiltshire Council could work on this with the group.

Councillor Mike Sankey asked in terms of the SEA whether it could look at the implications of the bypass and the canal if they were to go ahead.

Vaughan explained unfortunately it could not, as these were not Neighbourhood Plan projects. Those responsible for these projects would have to undertake their own SEA.

### **Timeline**

Vaughan went through the Gantt Chart on the timeline of the Neighbourhood Plan Review and explained the Regulation 14 consultation had slipped by 3 months from early in the new year to April/May/June time due to various factors as previously explained in the meeting, including the housing site allocation as currently waiting for AECOM to undertake the site selection assessment process prior to selection by the steering group. However, as long as the various evidence bases are available by the time the plan goes to consultation everything should be fine.

Vaughan explained stakeholder consultation would hopefully take place in February/March. Other informal consultation would need to be undertaken on local green spaces, with all landowners being given an opportunity in providing their comments on the designation. Also, all landowners needed to be consulted for housing allocations. This was also time to undertake community/trader/stakeholder engagement with regard to the town centre masterplan and get their input.

Vaughan explained during this time housing sites would be selected; however, it was difficult to put draft sites selections on the table informally, and made a recommendation to go straight to Regulation 14, however he suggested he could look at this if the steering group wanted to undertake some informal consultation on the housing allocations.

Councillor Pafford asked if there was a required period of consultation, or whether it was flexible.

Vaughan explained the formal Regulation 14 consultation had to be for at least 6 weeks, with informal consultation there was no requirement and was in the gift of the steering group. However, the strategy was to recoup as much slippage time as possible, in order to submit the draft plan to Wiltshire Council

after July when the period of Paragraph 14 protection ends and will keep pressure on to get the various aspects of work completed, such as housing site allocation work as soon as possible.

Vaughan explained unfortunately the Steering Group were still in the dark on the Regulation 19 housing allocation in the Local Plan but did not think it would undermine the content of the revised plan. After the Regulation 14 consultation period was when everyone including Wiltshire Council, land agents and the public had an opportunity to make representation and with big development interests in the plan.

Vaughan reminded the Steering Group not to under estimate the number of comments, which will come forward which would require a significant amount of work to get through the comments and make revisions, in order to submit a robust plan.

The Parish Clerk explained the current neighbourhood plan had at least 1000 individual comments from over 200 people all of which required a response.

#### **bC) Policy 7 Whitley Housing Site Allocation review to be held in closed session**

The item was discussed in closed session, with Councillor Pafford reminding those present of the confidentiality of the item as no decisions had been made.

It was agreed as both Councillors Harris and Goodhind were members of the Steering Group task groups and both councillors of the qualifying bodies, they could remain for this item.

The Parish Clerk explained members of the Housing Task Group and both Clerks had met with the landowners of the housing allocation in the current Neighbourhood Plan to discuss their proposals for the site which was allocated in Policy 7 in the current Plan, as part of the Review process.

### **7. To approve Community Communications**

Vaughan explained this was part of an engagement process, linking in with informal engagement and then formal engagement and keeping people on message and giving them advanced warning of community engagement early next year.

The Town Clerk explained it was hoped to do some engagement on Saturday 3rd December at the Christmas Fayre, however it was felt there was not enough time to do something constructive, such as town centre masterplan. Therefore, rather than let the opportunity go, a leaflet had been designed with the input of Melksham News (with 2,000 being printed) in order to raise awareness of what has taken place so far and what else will be taking place in the future, such as consultation on the plan. It was hoped this would generate interest and

encourage as many people as possible to engage in the new year with the Neighbourhood Plan process.

Several volunteers were sought with several coming forward to help hand out leaflets from 12pm through to the end of the Christmas Fair and Lights Switch On event at 8pm.

Both Clerks thanked Melksham News in helping design the leaflet and others who had provided input on the design. A link to the leaflet would be provided on the Neighbourhood Plan website, as well as being available on both councils' websites.

**8. To approve future spend, quotation for additional work by Place, latest invoices and note current financial report.**

The Parish Clerk explained Vaughan had provided a summary of additional work required for approval by the Steering Group:

Final Draft comments and revisions:	£550
Library, Campus, edge of centre cluster site planning:	£550
Stakeholder/community engagement:	£1,100
Town Centre Masterplan engagement work:	£825
Car parking study:	<u>£275</u>
TOTAL	£3,300 (excl VAT)

**Resolved:** To approve for payment the following invoices, excluding VAT.

£250	Melksham News (for design work)
£488	Nettl (printing 2000 leaflets)
£2,709.35	Place (for work undertaken to date) via Locality Grant and agreed Parish & Town Council spend)

To approve the quotation of £3,300 from Place to undertake the extra work as stated.

**9. To agree date and venue of Next Meeting of Steering Group**

Vaughan explained some of the things hoped to be ready by 25th January for the Steering Group to go through may not be completed by this time and therefore suggested the Steering Group meet in February.

As it was hoped to undertake community engagement in the new year, it was suggested to hold a meeting in January to sign this off.

**Resolved:** A Steering Group meeting be held on 25th January at 6.30pm at the MWPC meeting venue in order to sign off on community engagement.

A Steering Group meeting be held on 22nd February at 6.30pm at MWPC meeting space to sign off on the various reports which should have been received by this time.

Meeting closed at 8.22

Signed .....  
Chair, 25 January 2023