

Meeting of Thruxton NDP Steering Group on 14.6.18 held in Machin Room at 19:30, TMH.

1. Details of attendees – LC as Chair, JD, MW, SC.
2. Apologies – KP, AL, BB, LW, SW.
3. Minutes of last Meeting – were accepted and to be uploaded on to website.

Matters arising– a. LC had asked the Parish Clerk if she had received further written responses to the pre-submission consultation. No further responses had been received by post.

b. LC had noted that there had been no responses from Park House Cross. AL had approached JD during the consultation process saying that the Thruxton Times distributor for PHC had said he had not seen the reply insert in the April TT for PHC Parishioners to complete. This situation needs clarification as every Parishioner must be given the same opportunity to respond to the consultation. LC will email Richard Smart, who coordinates TT delivery, to ascertain the facts and then she will report back. POST SCRIPT – LC has received a reply from Richard Smart who personally inserted the consultation response forms in to every April TT for further distribution. With this being the case, LC is confident that every householder received a TT and a pre-submission consultation response form.

c. It was noted that there was a poor consultation response from Dauntsey Lane – only one responder – JD will check that the responder is in fact within the Parish.

d. Thanks to SC for collation of the consultation results so far and to Pat for validation.

e. KP has emailed Southern Water asking for clarification of their pre-submission consultation response in view of the recent frequent tankering of water that has occurred on the Parish boundary. We await the response.

f. KP emailed SD with an update on the pre-submission consultation responses so far. KP asked for advice on replying to TVBC's comments, especially regarding some of the technical responses and what the cost to the SG would be for this work. KP also asked about managing changes to the current pre-submission document and how to go forward with this and how much it would cost if SD were to help us? SD was also asked to quote for preparation of Basic Conditions Statement.

g. SD's response was read to the meeting. In summary, their response to TVBC's comments will be done by them free of charge. They suggest the SG review and comment on all responses first. SD will

send details on how other responses to consultations have been tackled to guide us. Further help with this would be charged according to time taken. The Basic Conditions Report could be done by SD and would cost £750. As a result, the Meeting would like SD to review the TVBC comments. Subsequent to this, a meeting with TVBC and KP/MW/LC would be arranged to discuss TVBC's comments further. Other work done by SD will depend what comes forward from the pre-submission responses and size of the SG's budget, although their preparation of the Basic Conditions Report was thought to be appropriate and could be afforded.

4. After discussion on how to analyse the pre-submission consultation responses, the following division of labour was proposed. The idea is that the named individual (who has some current expertise in the relevant field) is to look at all the responses in SC's pre-submission response collation document relevant to their field. At a future meeting of the SG (date to be confirmed and for details see below), they would then lead on a short presentation of the results to the SG before a discussion of the issues raised would take place. This may lead to amendment of the Policies or text of the pre-submission document. Guidance on how to do this will be circulated once SD sends details of how other groups have tackled such tasks. It was felt that a consistent approach should be agreed by all.

Mike – Environment and landscape policies minus EN8, EN5, EN9, EN10.

Kate – Housing and Design policies.

Bill – Economy and Thruxton Airfield.

Louisa – Heritage, EN8 and Historic England Response.

Simon and Liz – Southern Water and Highways response with EN5, EN9 , EN10, CI4, CI5 CI6.

Kate and Louisa – TVBC and Orchard Homes response – both to be presented at the end of the next Meeting with highlighted points addressed individually and in light of Parishioners' responses.

John – Community Infrastructure and wellbeing – CI1, CI2, CI3.

Steve – General Presentation comments.

Alan – to look at all PHC and TD responses in all fields to see if in any recurrent themes specific to these 2 separate areas come through. Only 1 response from Dauntsey Lane so far.

5. Fete – After discussion, it was felt that the Neighbourhood Development Plan would NOT be represented at a Stall at next week’s fete. MW, remembering the last fete where not much interest was shown, felt we had currently nothing new to present to the Parish as no significant response analysis had been done. LC pointed out that there had recently been meetings for Parishioners to attend to access information and to ask questions. It was felt that the Thruxton Times should keep Parishioners updated on what was happening with the NDP and this would access all households on a monthly basis. Once the outcomes from the analysis of the pre-submission consultation are known, a more detailed Thruxton Times article should set out results, outcomes and forward timetables. It should also address some of the misconceptions that appear apparent between Parishioners’ expectations and what the NDP can actually deliver. LC to talk to KP re TT updates.
  
6. Finance update – BB had emailed LC with a finance update as he was unable to attend the meeting. There is £1977.20 available. BB feels that no further grants are currently available. BB has approached Groundworks once more but it is unclear at present if further funds could be made available. There is a possibility of ? £1K from TVBC and the Meeting requests that BB applies for this when he returns from holiday. MW will check re Parish Council funding that could be made available, including the £750 that the Parish Council has currently offered us. MW will report back.
  
7. AOB – SC – 3 forms need comments clarifying due to handwriting/formatting issues. LC to do and upload and update response collation. SC gave LC all uploaded comments to date. LC will discuss with KP re storage. JD gave each member of the SG present at the Meeting a hard copy of the pre-submission document. LC has the spare.
  
8. DATE OF NEXT MEETING – after discussion, it was agreed that a weekend day was needed for a long SG meeting to carefully review all pre-submission responses and record change or otherwise as a result. It was requested that some time be given to SG members to review and collate responses for their areas above, before this meeting. MW stressed the importance of talking to each other during this period about progress and problems. We all need to adopt the same written process for consistency and hopefully SD’s advice will help this process.  
 The following availability/non-availability was noted:  
 BB not available: 9-19<sup>th</sup> June inclusive, 21<sup>st</sup> and 23<sup>rd</sup> June, 6-10<sup>th</sup> July, 10-20<sup>th</sup> August  
 LC not available: 23<sup>rd</sup> June, 7-8<sup>th</sup> July 11-26 August  
 Saturdays and Sunday afternoons better for MW  
 SC only free: Sunday 2<sup>nd</sup>, Sunday 23<sup>rd</sup> and Sat 29<sup>th</sup> 30<sup>th</sup> – free dates  
 MW away first 2 weeks of September.

**SO**

Tentatively, **Saturday 29<sup>th</sup> Sept** from 10am in Machin Room for long meeting of SG to review all responses. JD will book Machin Room.